

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Atlanta Regional Commission

- 1995     *Bicycle Transportation and Pedestrian Walkways Plan*. Atlanta.
- 2000a    *Transportation Solutions for a New Century. Volume I: 2025 Regional Transportation Plan*. Atlanta.
- 2000b    *Atlanta Region Transportation Planning Fact Book*. Atlanta.
- 2000c    *Atlanta Regional Congestion Management System, Biennial Congestion Report*. Atlanta. Prepared by Wilbur Smith Associates.
- 2001a    *Transportation Improvement Program Handbook for the FY 2002–2004*. Atlanta.
- 2001b    *Regional Data*. Atlanta Regional Commission. Atlanta. Available at [www.atlantaregional.com/regionaldata/censusdata.html](http://www.atlantaregional.com/regionaldata/censusdata.html).

### Bowen, William R.

- 1981     *An Intensive Archaeological Assessment of the Proposed Embury Farm Sand and Gravel Operation at Chattahoochee River, Gwinnett County, Georgia*. On file at Department of Anthropology, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.

### Braley, Chad O.

- 1987     *A Preliminary Archeological Survey of the Discovery Tract, Cobb County, Georgia*. Athens, Georgia: Southeastern Archeological Services, Inc.

### Braley, Chad O., Karen G. Wood, and T. Jeffrey Price

- 1992     *An Archaeological and Historical Survey of a Fifteen Acre Tract in Roswell, Fulton County, Georgia*. Athens, Georgia. Southeastern Archeological Services, Inc.

### Brown, Fred, and Sherri M. L. Smith

- 1997     *The Riverkeeper's Guide to the Chattahoochee River From It's Origination at Chattahoochee Gap to Apalachicola Bay*. C.I. Publishing, Atlanta, Georgia. 352 p.

### Brown, Leonard E.

- 1980     *Historic Resource Study: Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area and the Chattahoochee River Corridor*. Tallahassee: National Park Service, Southeast Regional Office.

### CH2M Hill

- 1998     *Watershed Characteristic Task Plan: Gwinnett County Watershed Assessment and Modeling*. Draft. Atlanta.

### City of Roswell

- n.d.      *Roswell Comprehensive Plan 2020. Transportation: Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan*. Roswell, Georgia.



Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area  
Draft General Management Plan/EIS  
Bibliography

Clark, W.Z., Jr., and A.C. Zisa

- 1976 *Physiographic Map of Georgia*. Atlanta, Georgia: Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Geologic and Water Resources Division.

Cobb Community Transit

- 2000 *Cobb Community Transit System Map*. Marietta, Georgia. Available at <http://www.cobbdot.org/cct.htm#map>

Council on Environmental Quality, Executive Office of the President

- 1978 "Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act." *Code of Federal Regulations* Title 40, Parts 1500–1508. Washington, D.C.
- 1980 Council on Environmental Quality Memorandum of August 11, 1980: Analysis of Impacts on Prime or Unique Agricultural Lands in Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act. Available at <http://ceq.eh.doe.gov/nepa/regs/exec81180.html>.

Robbins, C.S., D.K. Dawson, and B.A. Dowell

- 1989 "Habitat Area Requirements of Breeding Forest Birds of the Middle Atlantic States." *Wildlife Monographs* 103:1–34. The Wildlife Society.

Federal Emergency Management Agency

- 1998 Floodplain Maps, 1998.

Forsyth County

- 1996 *Forsyth County Master Land Use and Development Plan, 1996–2016*. Atlanta: Robert and Company.
- 2001 Personal communication from Tim Allen, Assistant Director of Engineering for Forsyth County Engineering Department, Cumming, Georgia, to John Martin, Principal Planner, Parsons, Tampa, Florida, November 15.

Gantt, Mary E.

- 1997 *Archaeological Resources Survey, Proposed Improvement of State Route 9/Atlanta Street, Roswell, Fulton County, Georgia*. Holly Springs, Georgia: R.S. Webb & Associates.

Gantt, Mary E., and Suzanne DeRosa

- 2000 *Cultural Resources Survey, Proposed New Trail System, Island Ford Unit, Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area, Fulton County, Georgia*. Holly Springs, Georgia: R.S. Webb & Associates.

Gardner, Jeffrey W., and W. Michael Reynolds

- 1993 *Archaeological Resources Survey and Evaluation of the Proposed Peachtree Industrial/McEver Road Widening and Reconstruction, Gwinnett and Hall Counties, Georgia*. GDOT Projects STP- 190- 1(9), (10), P.I.#s 121673 and 121676. Atlanta: Brockington and Associates, Inc.

Garrow & Associates, Inc.

- 1990 *A Protected Species and Wetlands Overview of the Chattahoochee River Corridor from I- 285 to Sope Creek, Cobb and Fulton Counties, Georgia*, by Linda G. Chafin. Atlanta: Devcon Design Group, Inc.



Georgia Natural Heritage Program, Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Division

- 2001 *Known or Potential Occurrences of Special Concern Plant and Animal Species on or near the CRNRA.*

Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division

- 1966 *A Biological Study of Sope Creek, Cobb County, Georgia.* On file at Georgia Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources. Atlanta.
- 1973 *Sope Creek Water Quality Investigation.* On file at Georgia Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources. Atlanta.

Gresham, T.H.

- 1987 *Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed Lake Sidney Lanier Reregulation Dam and Lake Area, Forsyth and Gwinnett counties, Georgia.* Atlanta: Southeastern Archaeological Services, Inc. for the USACE- Savannah District. DACW21- 86- M- 0549.

Gwinnett County Transit

- 2001 "Welcome to Gwinnett County Transit." Lawrenceville, Georgia. Available at [www.gctransit.com](http://www.gctransit.com).

Hamilton, C.E.

- 1974 *An Archaeological Reconnaissance of the Chattahoochee River Corridor between Buford Dam and Georgia 20 Highway Bridge.* Tallahassee: Florida State University.

Heiman, Karen

- 2000 *Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species Survey Results for the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area.* National Park Service, Atlanta, Georgia

Hess, T., A. Mauldin, and G. Walker

- 1981 *Evaluation of Some Important River Systems within the Walton District of the East Central Region: Middle Chattahoochee River Tributaries.* Atlanta: Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Game and Fish Division.

Johnson, Douglas H.

- 2001 *Habitat fragmentation effects on birds in grasslands and wetlands: a critique of our knowledge.* Great Plains Research 11(2):211- 213. Jamestown, ND: Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center Home Page. <http://www.npwrc.usgs.gov/resource/2003/habfrag/habfrag.htm> (Version 21FEB2003).

Ledbetter, R. Jerald, William R. Chapman, T. Jeffrey Price, and Adam King

- 1991 *An Archaeological Testing of a Portion of 9FU4 at the Site of the Proposed Riverside Road Pump Station, Roswell, Georgia.* Athens, Georgia: Southeastern Archaeological Services, Inc.

Magennis, Ann L, and Ishmael Williams

- 1978 *A Cultural Resource Survey of the Proposed 40- inch O.D. Pipeline, Powder Springs, Georgia, to the Savannah River. Phase I: Complete Survey of the First 28.5 Miles.* Marietta, Georgia: Soil Systems, Inc.



*Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area*  
*Draft General Management Plan/EIS*  
*Bibliography*

Markham, M. Virginia, and Jeffrey L. Holland

- 1996 *Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of 286 Acres West of the Chattahoochee River in Forsyth County, Georgia*. Atlanta: Garrow & Associates, Inc.

Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority

- 2001 MARTA transit system maps. Atlanta. Available at <http://www.itsmarta.com>.

Miller, Z., J. McCollum, L.C. Barrett, H. Reheis, and A. Hallum

- 1998 *Georgia Rivers: An Initial Assessment*. Atlanta.  
[http://www.state.ga.us/dnr/envIRON/gaenvIRON\\_files/watrqual\\_files/rc2000.htm](http://www.state.ga.us/dnr/envIRON/gaenvIRON_files/watrqual_files/rc2000.htm).

National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior

- 1989 *Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area, Georgia, General Management Plan, Development Concept Plan, and Environmental Assessment*.
- 1995a Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement among the National Park Service, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the National Council of State Historic Preservation Officers. Available at <http://www.nps.gov/phso/archeology/PROGAGR.htm>
- 1995b Chattahoochee River NRA Worksheet containing monthly traffic counts entering each CRNRA unit in 1995. Atlanta.
- 1998a *Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area Visitor Study*. Moscow, Idaho: University of Idaho Cooperative Park Studies Unit for the National Park Service.
- 1998b *Chattahoochee River NRA 1998 Visitor Survey Card Data Report*. Moscow, Idaho: University of Idaho Cooperative Park Studies Unit for the National Park Service.
- 1998c *Wetlands in the National Parks*. National Park Service, Water Resources Division. NPSD- 1269. Available at <http://www.nature.nps.gov/water/wetlbro.htm>.
- 2000a Chattahoochee River NRA Worksheet containing monthly traffic counts entering each CRNRA unit in 2000. Atlanta.
- 2000b *Director's Order #53: Special Park Uses and Reference Manual*. Washington, D.C.
- 2000c *Management Policies 2001*. Washington, D.C.: National Park Service. NPS D1416.
- 2000d *National Park Service Statistical Abstract 2000*. Denver: National Park Service, Public Use Statistics Office.
- 2000e *Water Resources Management Plan, Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area*, by Sam Kunkle, and David Vana- Miller. NPS D- 48.
- 2001a *Cost Estimating Guidelines with Class C Cost Data: New Construction*. Denver: National Park Service, Denver Service Center.



- 2001b *Director's Order #12 and Handbook: Conservation Planning, Environmental Impact Analysis, and Decision Making.* Washington, D.C.
- 2001c Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area, Sewer System Database Project. Prepared by Parsons Engineering Science, Inc. February 2001.
- n.d. *Outline of Prehistory and History: Southeastern North America and the Caribbean.* Available at <http://www.cr.nps.gov/seac/outline.htm>.

O'Grady, Patricia, and Charles B. Poe

- 1980 *Cultural Resource Inventory Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area Final Report.* Athens, Georgia: Southeast Archaeological Center, National Park Service.

Parsons

- 2001 *Fulton County- Johns Creek Water Resources Management Plan.* Final. Fulton County, Georgia.

Plafkin, J.L., M.T. Barbour, K.D. Porter, S.K. Gross, and R.M. Hughes

- 1989 *Rapid Bioassessment Protocols for Use in Streams and Rivers: Benthic Macroinvertebrates and Fish.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water Regulations and Standards. EPA 440- 4- 89- 001.

Primack, Richard B.

- 1993 *Essentials of Conservation Biology.* Sunderland, Massachusetts: Sinauer Associates.

Rogers, Ronnie H., and Chad O. Braley

- 1991 *An Archaeological Survey of the Proposed Riverside Road Pump Station and Associated Pipeline Corridors, Roswell, Georgia.* Athens, Georgia: Southeastern Archaeological Services.

Scalley, C.

- 2001 Personal communication with Chris Scalley, Director of the Chattahoochee Tailwater Environmental Foundation, Inc., April 25, 2001.

Secretary of the Interior

- 1983 *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation.*
- 1996 *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes.*

Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture

- 1958 *Soil Survey, Fulton County Georgia.*
- 1960 *Soil Survey, Forsyth County Georgia.*
- 1967 *Soil Survey, Gwinnett County Georgia.*



Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area  
Draft General Management Plan/EIS  
Bibliography

- 1973     *Soil Survey, Cobb County Georgia.*
- 1982     *Supplement to the Soil Survey of Fulton County, Georgia.*
- 1996     *Supplement to the Soil Survey of Cobb County, Georgia.*

Trust for Public Land

- 2001     Personal communication with Kevin Johnson, Trust for Public Land, May 2001.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

- 1973     *Floodplain Information, Chattahoochee River, Buford Dam to Whitesburg, Georgia.* Mobile, Alabama: Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Mobile District.
- 1974     *Floodplain Information, Rottenwood Creek, Vicinity of Marietta, Cobb County, Georgia.* Mobile, Alabama: Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Mobile District.
- 1987     *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual.* Vicksburg, Mississippi: U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Environmental Laboratory. Technical Report Y- 87- 1, NTIS No. AD A176912.
- 1998     *Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Apalachicola- Chattahoochee- Flint River Basins.* U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District.

U.S. Census Bureau

- 2000     Census Bureau Home Page. Available at [www.census.gov](http://www.census.gov).

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of the Interior

- 2001     *Wetlands Data.* Available at <http://enterprise.nwi.fws.gov/downloads.htm>.

Webb, Robert S., and S. Burns

- 1997     *Cultural Resources Survey, Proposed Trail System, Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area, Forsyth County, Georgia.* Holly Springs, Georgia: R.S. Webb & Associates.

Webb, Robert S., and Neil A. Duncan

- 1997     *Cultural Resources Survey, Proposed River Moore Farm Development Site, Development Area 1, Gwinnett County, Georgia.* Holly Springs, Georgia: R.S. Webb & Associates.

Webb, Robert S., and Mary E. Gantt

- 1995     *Cultural Resources Survey, Proposed Silver Creek Land Exchange Site, Forsyth County, Georgia.* Holly Springs, Georgia: R.S. Webb & Associates.
- 1996a     *Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluative Testing at Site 9FO218, Proposed Old Atlanta Transmission Line and Substation Site, Forsyth and Gwinnett Counties, Georgia.* Holly Springs, Georgia: R.S. Webb & Associates.
- 1996b     *Cultural Resources Survey, Phases IV- X, Silver Creek Development Site, Forsyth County, Georgia.* Holly Springs, Georgia: R.S. Webb & Associates.



Webb, Robert S., Scot J. Keith, Grace F. Keith, and Neil L. Norman

- 1998     *Cultural Resources Survey, Proposed Fairgreen Development Site, Gwinnett County, Georgia*. Holly Springs, Georgia: R.S. Webb & Associates.

Wharton, C.H.

- 1978     *The Natural Environments of Georgia*. Atlanta: Georgia Department of Natural Resources.

Worth, John E.

- 2003     *Georgia Before Oglethorpe: A Resource Guide to Georgia's Early Colonial Period, 1521- 1733*. Available at <http://www.spanishflorida.net/gboindex.htm>.





## **GLOSSARY OF TERMS**



## GLOSSARY OF TERMS

The controlling definitions for terms under the President's Council on Environmental Quality National Environmental Policy Act regulations are contained at 40 Code of Federal Regulations; the numbers in parentheses refer to the appropriate section. These definitions are provided as a supplement to those regulatory definitions.

**Categorical exclusion** (1508.4)—An action with no measurable environmental impact which is described in one of the categorical exclusion lists in section 3- 3 or 3- 4 and for which no exceptional circumstances (section 3- 5) exist.

**Connected actions** (1508.25)—Actions that are closely related. They automatically trigger other actions that have environmental impacts, they cannot or will not proceed unless other actions have been taken previously or simultaneously, or they are interdependent parts of a larger action and/or depend on the larger action for their justification.

**Conservation planning and impact assessment**—Within the National Park Service, this process is synonymous with the National Environmental Policy Act process. This process evaluates alternative courses of action and impacts so that decisions are made in accord with the conservation and preservation mandate of the NPS Organic Act.

**Cooperating agency** (1508.5)—A federal agency other than the one preparing the National Environmental Policy Act document (lead agency) that has jurisdiction over the proposal by virtue of law or special expertise and that has been deemed a cooperating agency by the lead agency. State or local governments, and/or Indian tribes, may be designated cooperating agencies as appropriate (see 1508.5 and 1502.6).

**Cultural resources** (NPS- 28, appendix A)—Aspects of a cultural system that are valued by or significantly representative of a culture or that contain significant information about a culture. A cultural resource may be a tangible entity or a cultural practice. Tangible cultural resources are categorized as districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects for the National Register of Historic Places, and as archeological resources, cultural landscapes, structures, museum objects, and ethnographic resources for NPS management purposes.

**Cumulative actions** (1508.25)—Actions that, when viewed with other actions in the past, the present, or the reasonably foreseeable future, regardless of who has undertaken or will undertake them, have an additive impact on the resource the proposal would affect.

**Cumulative impact** (1508.7)—The impacts of cumulative actions.

**Direct effect** (1508.8)—An impact that occurs as a result of the proposal or alternative in the same place and at the same time as the action.

**Environmental assessment** (1508.9)—A brief National Environmental Policy Act document that is prepared to (a) help determine whether the impact of a proposal or alternatives could be significant; (b) aid the National Park Service in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act by evaluating a proposal that will have no significant impacts, but that may have measurable adverse impacts; or (c) evaluate a proposal that either is not described on the list of categorically excluded actions, or is on the list but exceptional circumstances (section 3- 5) apply.

**Environmental impact statement** (1508.11)—A detailed National Environmental Policy Act document that is prepared when a proposal or alternatives have the potential for significant impact on the human environment.

**Environmental screening process**—The analysis that precedes a determination of the appropriate level of National Environmental Policy Act documentation. The minimum requirements of the environmental screening process are a site visit,



consultation with any agency that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise, and the completion of a screening checklist. The process must be complete for all NPS actions that have the potential for environmental impact and are not described in section 3-3.

**Environmentally preferred alternative** (1505.2, Q6a)—Of the alternatives analyzed, the one that would best promote the policies in the National Environmental Policy Act section 101. This is usually selected by the interdisciplinary team members. It is presented in the NPS National Environmental Policy Act document (draft and final environmental assessment or environmental impact statement) for public review and comment.

**Exceptional circumstances**—Circumstances that, if they apply to a project described in the NPS categorical exclusion lists (sections 3-3 and 3-4), mean a categorical exclusion is inappropriate and an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement must be prepared because the action may have measurable or significant impacts. Exceptional circumstances are described in section 3-5.

**Finding of no significant impact (FONSI)** (1508.13)—A determination based on an environmental assessment and other factors in the public planning record for a proposal that, if implemented, would have no significant impact on the human environment.

**Human environment** (1508.14)—Defined by the Council on Environmental Quality as the natural and physical environment, and the relationship of people with that environment (1508.14). Although the socioeconomic environment receives less emphasis than the physical or natural environment in the Council on Environmental Quality regulations, the National Park Service considers it an integral part of the human environment.

**Impact topics**—Specific natural, cultural, or socioeconomic resources that would be affected by the proposed action or alternatives (including no action). The magnitude, duration, and timing of the effect to each of these resources are evaluated in the impact section of an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement.

**Indirect impact** (1508.8)—Reasonably foreseeable impacts that occur removed in time or space from the proposed action. These are “downstream” impacts, future impacts, or the impacts of reasonably expected connected actions (e.g., growth of an area after a highway to it is complete).

**Issues**—In the National Environmental Policy Act, issues are environmental, social, and economic problems or effects that may occur if the proposed action or alternatives (including no action) are implemented or continue to be implemented.

**Lead agency** (1508.16)—The agency either preparing or taking primary responsibility for preparing the National Environmental Policy Act document.

**Life Cycle Costing (Analysis)**—An accounting method that analyzes the total costs of a product or service, including construction, maintenance, manufacturing, marketing, distribution, useful life, salvage, and disposal.

**Major federal action** (1508.18)—Actions that have a large federal presence and that have the potential for significant impacts to the human environment. They include adopting policy, implementing rules or regulations; adopting plans, programs, or projects; ongoing activities; issuing permits; or financing projects completed by another entity.

**Memo to file**—A memo to the planning record or statutory compliance file that NPS offices may complete when (a) National Environmental Policy Act has already been completed in site-specific detail for a proposal, usually as part of a document of larger scope, or (b) a time interval has passed since the National Environmental Policy Act document was approved, but information in that document is still accurate.

**Mitigated Environmental Assessment** (Q40)—An environmental assessment that has been rewritten to incorporate mitigation into a proposal or to change a proposal to reduce impacts to below significance.



**Mitigation** (1508.20)—A modification of the proposal or alternative that lessens the intensity of its impact on a particular resource.

**National Environmental Policy Act process**—The objective analysis of a proposal to determine the degree of its environmental and interrelated social and economic impacts on the human environment, alternatives and mitigation that reduce that impact, and the full and candid presentation of the analysis to, and involvement of, the interested and affected public.

**Notices of availability**—Separate notices submitted to the *Federal Register* that the draft environmental impact statement and the final environmental impact statement are ready for distribution.

**Notice of intent** (1508.22)—The notice submitted to the *Federal Register* that an environmental impact statement will be prepared. It describes the proposed action and alternatives, identifies a contact person in the National Park Service, and gives time, place, and descriptive details of the agency's proposed scoping process.

**Preferred alternative** (1502.14 (e))—The alternative an NPS decision- maker has identified as preferred at the draft environmental impact statement stage or environmental assessment. Identification of the preferred alternative helps the public focus its comments during review of the National Environmental Policy Act document.

**Programmatic documents**—Broader scope environmental assessments or environmental impact statements that describe the impacts of proposed policy changes, programs, or plans.

**Proposal** (1508.23)—The stage at which the National Park Service has a goal and is actively preparing to make a decision on one or more alternative means of accomplishing that goal. The goal can be a project, plan, policy, program, and so forth. The National Environmental Policy Act process begins when the effects can be meaningfully evaluated.

**Record of decision** (1505.2)—The document that is prepared to substantiate a decision based on an environmental impact statement. It includes a statement of the decision made, a detailed discussion of decision rationale, and the reasons for not adopting all mitigation measures analyzed, if applicable.

**Scoping** (1508.25)—Internal NPS decision- making on issues, alternatives, mitigation measures, the analysis boundary, appropriate level of documentation, lead and cooperating agency roles, available references and guidance, defining purpose and need, and so forth. External scoping is the early involvement of the interested and affected public.

**Tiering** (1508.28)—The use of broader, programmatic National Environmental Policy Act documents to discuss and analyze cumulative regional impacts and define policy direction, and the incorporation by reference of this material in subsequent, narrower documents to avoid duplication and focus on issues “ripe for decision” in each case.

**Vessel**—Under 36 Code of Federal Regulations 1.4, vessels are defined as every type or description of craft, other than a seaplane on the water, used or capable of being used as a means of transportation on water, including a buoyant device permitting or capable of free flotation.



## **APPENDIX A**

### **LIST OF RELEVANT LEGISLATION**



## APPENDIX A: LIST OF RELEVANT LEGISLATION

Laws and executive orders that apply to the management of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area are provided below.

### NATIONAL PARK SERVICE ENABLING LEGISLATION

Act of August 25, 1916 (National Park Service Organic Act); Public Law 64- 235; 16 United States Code Section 1 *et seq.* as amended

Reorganization Act of March 3, 1933; 47 Stat. 1517

General Authorities Act, October 7, 1976; Public Law 94- 458; 90 Stat. 1939; 16 United States Code 1a- 1 *et seq.*

Act amending the Act of October 2, 1968 (commonly called Redwoods Act), March 27, 1978; Public Law 95- 250; 92 Stat. 163; 16 United States Code Subsection(s) 1a- 1, 79a- q

National Parks and Recreation Act, November 10, 1978; Public Law 95- 625; 92 Stat. 3467; 16 United States Code 1 *et seq.*

### OTHER LAWS AFFECTING NPS OPERATIONS

#### Accessibility

Americans with Disabilities Act; Public Law 101- 336; 104 Stat. 327; 42 United States Code 12101

Architectural Barriers Act of 1968; Public Law 90- 480; 82 Stat. 718; 42 United States Code 4151 *et seq.*

Rehabilitation Act of 1973; Public Law 93- 112; 87 Stat. 357; 29 United States Code 701 *et seq.* as amended by the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1974; 88 Stat. 1617

#### Cultural Resources

American Indian Religious Freedom Act; Public Law 95- 341; 92 Stat. 469; 42 United States Code 1996

Antiquities Act of 1906; Public Law 59- 209; 34 Stat. 225; 16 United States Code 432; 43 Code of Federal Regulations 3

Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974; Public Law 93- 291; 88 Stat. 174; 16 United States Code 469

Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979; Public Law 96- 95; 93 Stat. 712; 16 United States Code 470aa *et seq.*; 43 Code of Federal Regulations 7, subparts A and B; 36 Code of Federal Regulations 79

Indian Sacred Sites. Executive Order 13007. 3 Code of Federal Regulations 196 (1997).

National Historic Preservation Act as amended; Public Law 89- 665; 80 Stat. 915; 16 United States Code 470 *et seq.*; 36 Code of Federal Regulations 18, 60, 61, 63, 68, 79, 800

Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties, Executive Order 11593; 36 Code of Federal Regulations 60, 61, 63, 800; 44 Federal Register 6068



Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act of 1976; Public Law 94- 541; 90 Stat. 2505; 42 United States Code 4151- 4156

## Natural Resources

Analysis of Impacts on Prime or Unique Agricultural Lands in Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act; E.S. 80- 3, 08/11/80, 45 Federal Register 59109

Clean Air Act as amended; Public Law Chapter 360; 69 Stat. 322; 42 United States Code 7401 *et seq.*

Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 as amended; Public Law 92- 583; 86 Stat. 1280; 16 United States Code 1451 *et seq.*

Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended; Public Law 93- 205; 87 Stat. 884; 16 United States Code 1531 *et seq.*

Executive Order 11988: Floodplain Management; 42 Federal Register 26951; 3 Code of Federal Regulations 121 (Supp 177)

Executive Order 11990: Protection of Wetlands; 42 Federal Register 26961; 3 Code of Federal Regulations 121 (Supp 177)

Executive Order 11991: Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality

Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act; Public Law 92- 516; 86 Stat. 973; 7 United States Code 136 *et seq.*

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (commonly referred to as Clean Water Act); Public Law 92- 500; 33 United States Code 1251 *et seq.* as amended by the Clean Water Act; Public Law 95- 217

Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 as amended; Public Law 85- 624; 72 Stat. 563; 16 United States Code 661 *et seq.*

Migratory Bird Conservation Act; Public Law Chapter 257; 45 Stat. 1222; 16 United States Code 715 *et seq.*

Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918; Public Law 186; 40 Stat. 755

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; Public Law 91- 190; 83 Stat. 852; 42 United States Code 4321 *et seq.*

National Park System Final Procedures for Implementing Executive Order. 11988 and 11990 (45 Federal Register 35916 as revised by 47 Federal Register 36718)

Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality; Executive Order 11514 as amended, 1970; Executive Order 11991; 35 Federal Register 4247; 1977; 42 Federal Register 26967)

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act; Public Law 94- 580; 30 Stat. 1148; 42 United States Code 6901 *et seq.*

Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899; 33 United States Code Chapter 425, as amended by Public Law 97- 332, October 15, 1982 and Public Law 97- 449; 33 United States Code 401- 403

Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 (Public Law 89- 80; 42 United States Code 1962 *et seq.*) and Water Resource Council's Principles and Standards; 44 Federal Register 723977

Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; Public Law 92- 419; 68 Stat. 666; 16 United States Code 100186



## Other

Administrative Procedures Act; 5 United States Code 551- 559, 701- 706

Concessions Policy Act of 1965; Public Law 89- 249; 79 Stat. 969; 16 United States Code 20 *et seq.*

Department of Transportation Act of 1966; Public Law 89- 670; 80 Stat. 931; 49 United States Code 303

Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act of 1974

Executive Order 12003: Energy Policy and Conservation; 3 Code of Federal Regulations 134 (Supp 1977); 42 United States Code 2601

Executive Order 12008: Federal Compliance with Pollution Control Standards

Executive Order 12372: Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs; 47 Federal Register 30959

Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act; Public Law 95- 307; 92 Stat. 353; 16 United States Code 1600 *et seq.*

Freedom of Information Act; Public Law 93- 502; 5 United States Code 552 *et seq.*

Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968; Public Law 90- 577; 40 United States Code 531- 535 and 31 United States Code 6501- 6508

Intergovernmental Coordination Act of 1969; 42 United States Code 4101, 4231, 4233

Noise Control Act of 1972 as amended; Public Law 92- 574; 42 United States Code 4901 *et seq.*

Outdoor Recreation Coordination Act of 1963; Public Law 88- 29; 77 Stat. 49

Payment in Lieu of Taxes Act; Public Law 94- 565; 90 Stat. 2662; 31 United States Code 6901 *et seq.*

Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982; 96 Stat. 2097; 23 United States Code 101; and many others

Wildfire Disaster Recovery Act; Public Law 101- 286





**APPENDIX B**

**PARK- SPECIFIC SPECIAL MANDATES**

**AND COMMITMENTS**



## APPENDIX B: PARK- SPECIFIC SPECIAL MANDATES AND COMMITMENTS

This section provides an overview of the special mandates and commitments that are specific to the management of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area. The following is a summary of key information on laws and regulations that have been enacted to manage the impact of activities along the Chattahoochee River corridor.

### ENABLING LEGISLATION

The Act of August 15, 1978 (Public Law 95- 344) established the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area and its boundaries, providing for the preservation and the protection of the natural, scenic, recreational, and historical values of the river. As created in the act, the recreation area consists of the river and its bed together with lands, waters, and interests therein, along the 48- mile corridor from Buford Dam to Peachtree Creek. The Act of October 30, 1984 (Public Law 98- 568) increased the park size from 6,300 acres to 6,800 acres. The Secretary of the Interior may make minor revisions to the boundary map to facilitate access to the recreation area.

In 1999, a bill was passed that approved addition of approximately 3,200 acres to the existing 6,800 acre park. Parcels within the new areas are currently being acquired by the National Park Service as they are negotiated with property owners. However, under this legislation, the National Park Service can only acquire land from willing sellers.

### EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION ACT

The State of Georgia Erosion and Sedimentation Act (OCGA 12- 7- 1) provides a mechanism for controlling erosion and sedimentation from land- disturbing activities by establishing a permit process. To receive a permit, an applicant must submit an erosion and sedimentation control plan which incorporates best management practices. Local governments, with oversight by the Georgia Environmental Protection Division and the area Soil and Water Conservation District, are primarily responsible for implementing the act. State law directs local governments to enact erosion and sedimentation ordinances, granting the local government the authority to issue permits for land- disturbing activities. Stream buffer zone requirements under the Erosion and Sedimentation Act state that land- disturbing activities shall not be conducted within:

- 25 feet of any state waters. Construction of drainage structures are allowed in the buffer zone and a variance may be granted by the director of the Environmental Protection Division; and
- 100 feet of trout streams. Variance may be granted by the director of the Environmental Protection Division.

Cobb County has adopted more stringent minimum requirements for the control of erosion and sedimentation. As established in the Official Code of Cobb County, in addition to the 25- foot buffer for any state waters, land disturbing activities shall not be conducted within:

- 50 feet of the banks of any stream in Cobb County, as defined on the Cobb County Stream Buffer Map dated June 8, 1999, where total watershed area intercepted is less than or equal to 5 square miles;
- 75 feet of the banks of any stream in Cobb County where total watershed area intercepted is equal to 5 square miles and less than or equal to 10 square miles;
- 100 feet of the banks of any stream in Cobb County where total watershed area intercepted is greater than 10 square miles; and
- 200 feet of the banks of Nickajack Creek, from Church Road downstream to its confluence with Mill Creek and from Buckner Road downstream to its confluence with the Chattahoochee River.

Cobb County also requires that developers complete BMP training before they can receive a land- disturbing permit.



## METROPOLITAN RIVER PROTECTION ACT

The Metropolitan River Protection Act (OCGA 12- 5- 440) was enacted in 1973 in recognition of both the value of the Chattahoochee River as a resource and its vulnerability to impacts from urban development. The act created a protection corridor encompassing all land within 2,000 feet of either bank of the Chattahoochee River for the 48 miles between Buford Dam and Peachtree Creek. In 1998, the Georgia General Assembly amended the act, extending the corridor another 36 miles to the downstream limits of the Atlanta Region in Fulton and Douglas Counties. The following local jurisdictions have land in the corridor: Cobb, Fulton, Gwinnett, Forsyth, and Douglas counties and the cities of Atlanta, Roswell, Berkeley Lake, Duluth, Suwanee, and Sugar Hill.

The Metropolitan River Protection Act directed the Atlanta Regional Commission to develop the Chattahoochee Corridor Plan establishing several criteria to minimize the impact of development of land along the river. The Metropolitan River Protection Act and the Chattahoochee Corridor Plan require that all land- disturbing activity within the protected corridor be reviewed and approved before the activity begins. The Atlanta Regional Commission is responsible for reviewing applications for land- disturbing activities and determining whether they are consistent with the Corridor Plan. Local governments then issue approvals based on commission findings, monitor development activities, and enforce the act if required. The Atlanta Regional Commission monitors local implementation and enforcement of the act. In Forsyth County, reviews are conducted and local implementation monitored by the Georgia Mountains Regional Development Center.

All land- disturbing activities must be consistent with the corridor plan. The corridor plan establishes three sets of standards:

**Vulnerability Standards:** All land in the corridor is in one of six vulnerability categories (A- F) based on the land's susceptibility to development impacts. Vulnerability categories limit development by restricting the percentage of an area that can be disturbed and the percentage that can be converted to impervious surfaces. Percentages range from 90 percent maximum land disturbance and 75 percent maximum impervious surface in the least restrictive category (A) to 10 percent maximum land disturbance and 2 percent impervious surface in the most restrictive category (F).

**Buffer Zone Standards:** Buffer zone standards require an undisturbed, natural vegetative buffer within 50 feet of the Chattahoochee River and prohibit all impervious surfaces within 150 feet of the river. Natural vegetative buffers are also required within 35 feet of designated tributaries (those shown as blue lines on 1:24,000 scale USGS topographic maps).

**Floodplain Standards:** Fill in the river's 100- year floodplain must be balanced with an equal volume of cut so that there is not a reduction in flood storage. Obstruction of flood flow is prohibited in this area. Within the river's 500- year floodplain, building height is limited to 35 feet above the existing grade.

## TRIBUTARY BUFFER ORDINANCES

The Metropolitan River Protection Act was amended in 1983 to require adoption of tributary buffer ordinances by jurisdictions that are outside of the corridor but have streams tributary to the corridor portion of the Chattahoochee River. Outside the corridor, tributary buffer ordinances are locally adopted and administered, with the width determined by individual jurisdiction. Buffer widths must be at least 25 feet, the minimum buffer for state waters under the Erosion and Sedimentation Act. Some localities have established larger buffers, such as:

South Fulton County has adopted the "South Fulton County Tributary Protection Ordinance," which requires that a 75-foot natural vegetative buffer be maintained on each side of all tributaries in unincorporated Fulton County south of the corporate city limits of Atlanta. An additional 25 feet of impervious surface setback shall be maintained adjacent to and outside of all required natural vegetative buffers.

North Fulton County has established the "Chattahoochee River Corridor Tributary Protection Area," which extends 35 feet on either side of all tributaries of the Chattahoochee River.

The official code of Cobb County requires that land- disturbing activities not be constructed within 50 to 200 feet of the banks of any stream in Cobb County.

Forsyth County requires a 50- foot natural vegetative buffer and a 75- foot impervious surface setback.



The city of Roswell has adopted a Chattahoochee Tributary Map that establishes tributary protection areas, requiring a minimum buffer of 50 feet with a 100- foot buffer along Big Creek and its tributaries.

The city of Alpharetta requires a 100- foot vegetative buffer and a 150- foot impervious surface setback.

## **PROTECTION OF WATER SUPPLY WATERSHEDS**

A water supply watershed is an area of land within the drainage basin upstream of a public drinking water intake. To help protect surface water supplies, the Georgia Planning Act of 1989 (OCGA 12- 2- 8) directs steps to protect the quality and quantity of water available from watersheds used for public water supply. Minimum criteria for the protection of water supply watersheds have been established in the Environmental Protection Division's Rules for Environmental Planning Criteria (Chapter 391- 3- 16).

Criteria for protection of surface water supplies require buffer zones and setbacks around streams and a maximum impervious surface density. The specific standards to be applied depend on the distance from the water intake and the size of the watershed. For streams within seven miles upstream of the water supply intake, a 100- foot vegetative buffer is required with a 150- foot impervious surface setback. Outside a seven- mile radius upstream of the water supply intake, the buffer and impervious surface setback requirements are 50 feet and 75 feet, respectively. There also must be an overall impervious surface density of 25 percent or less.

Forsyth County and the cities of Roswell and Alpharetta are all located in the Big Creek water supply watershed. Forsyth County is located outside the seven- mile radius upstream of the surface water intake, thus requiring a 50- foot natural vegetative buffer, a 75- foot impervious surface setback, and an overall impervious surface density of 25 percent or less. Alpharetta and Roswell are located within seven miles of the surface water intake, and thus require a 100- foot vegetative buffer, a 150- foot impervious surface setback, and an overall impervious surface density of 25 percent or less.

## **STORMWATER MANAGEMENT**

Stormwater management programs are implemented at both state and local levels. At the state level, the Environmental Protection Division has implemented a permit program that relies on the National Pollutant Elimination System to regulate discharge of stormwater to streams and rivers. Phase I of the program applies to medium and large municipal separate storm sewer systems, construction activity disturbing five acres of land or greater, and eleven categories of industrial activity. Large and medium systems are defined by populations greater than 250,000 and populations between 100,000 and 250,000 respectively. Metropolitan Atlanta fits the definition of a large municipal system, and permit requirements apply to Fulton and Gwinnett counties and all incorporated cities. Phase II of the program requires additional operators of small municipal separate storm sewer systems (serving populations of at 10,000 with a population density of 1000 people per square mile) and operators of small construction sites (1 to 5 acres) to be covered by National Pollutant Elimination System permits.

State permit requirements include development of local stormwater management programs to control the quantity and quality of stormwater release. Stormwater management ordinances are adopted by local governments to provide for implementation and enforcement of their stormwater management program. Ordinances generally require the use of BMPs and submittal and approval of stormwater management plans for new developments. A number of municipalities, like Gwinnett County, require that controls be included to maintain runoff from a developed site at the same level as before development. This is usually accomplished through detention and retention structures that store excess runoff and release it slowly, thus allowing sediment to settle and not increasing downstream flooding.

## **TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD**

Under Section 303 (d) of the Clean Water Act, states are required to develop lists of streams and water bodies that do not meet ambient water quality standards. The resulting inventory of impaired streams, called the 303 (d) list, is updated every two years by states and is the basis for decisions related to restoring water quality. The law requires that the states establish priority rankings



for waters on the lists and develop total maximum daily loads for these waters. A total maximum daily load is a calculation of the maximum amount of a pollutant that a waterbody can receive and continue to meet its designated use.

Based on an evaluation of the states' implementation of their Clean Water Act 303 (d) responsibilities, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency developed changes and improvements to the total maximum daily load regulations. On July 13, 2000, the agency issued a final total maximum daily load rule that will improve current regulations. Congress has required the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (delegated to the Environmental Protection Division) to establish total maximum daily loads for the Chattahoochee River basin by 2002, under the current total maximum daily load regulation.

## SERVICEWIDE LAWS AND POLICIES

This section summarizes the most appropriate of the legal and administrative mandates that apply to managing all units of the national park service. These are measures that the National Park Service must strive to meet, regardless of the alternative selected for the long- term management of the Chattahoochee National Recreation Area. The body of laws and executive orders that guide park management, with their legal citations, are identified in Appendix A.

### **The National Park Service Organic Act and the Redwood Act Amendment to the National Park Service General Authorities Act**

One of the most important statutory directives for the National Park Service (NPS) is provided by the interrelations of the NPS Organic Act of 1916 and the Redwood Act Amendment to the NPS General Authorities Act of 1970. The Organic Act mandates that the National Park Service "shall promote and regulate the use of Federal areas known as national parks, monuments, and reservations by such means and measures as conform to the fundamental purpose of said parks, monuments, and reservations, which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

The General Authorities Act amends the Organic Act to broaden the types of areas that are included in the national park system, such as national seashores, recreation areas, and parkways. The Redwood Act further amends the General Authorities Act to reassert system- wide the high standard of protection set forth in the Organic Act. In the Redwood Act, "Congress further reaffirms, declares, and directs that the promotion and regulation of the various areas of the Nation Park System shall be consistent with and founded in the purpose established by the first section of the Act of August 25, 1916, to the common benefit of all the people of the United States. The authorization of activities shall be construed and the protection, management, and administration of these areas shall be conducted in light of the high public value and integrity on the National Park System and shall not be exercised in derogation of the values and purposes for which these various areas have been established, except as may have been or shall be directly and specifically provided by Congress."

Both the Organic Act and the General Authorities Act, as amended by the Redwood Act, define a single standard for the management of the park service: to safeguard the units of the national park system, conserving resources and values for enjoyment of all people of the United States and prohibiting impairment. Director's Order 55, *Interpreting the National Park Service Organic Act*, serves as the NPS interpretation of the meaning of the Organic Act and the General Authorities Act, as amended.

### **National Historic Preservation Act**

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to "expand and maintain a national register of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture." Section 106 of the act requires federal agencies to consider the effects of their undertakings on National Register properties and to allow the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation "a reasonable opportunity to comment" on such undertakings. The National Register of Historic Places was expanded from the original roster of historic landmarks and areas of the National Park System to a



comprehensive inventory of historic properties nationwide. National Park Service actions affecting properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places are subject to review by state historic preservation officers and the Advisory Council.

Section 110 requires among other things that the park to "establish a preservation program to protect and preserve historic properties in consultation with others" and that this program ensure "that historic properties under the jurisdiction or control of [the National park Service], are identified, evaluated, and nominated to the National Register." Further, Section 110 requires "that such properties under the jurisdiction or control of [the park] as are listed in or may be eligible for the National Register are managed and maintained in a way that considers the preservation of their historic, archaeological, architectural, and cultural values in compliance with section 106 of this Act and gives special consideration to the preservation of such values in the case of properties designated as having National significance." Section 112 requires that studies or other actions taken with regards to historic properties be done by personnel or contractors who meet appropriate professional qualifications standards developed by the Secretary of the Interior. It also requires that the park maintain data from historic properties studies in an appropriate database available to prospective researchers.

### **National Environmental Policy Act**

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 states as policy that federal agencies must assess the environmental impacts of any proposed action that they fund, support, permit, or implement. It specifically directs federal agencies to document the environmental impact of the proposed action, any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposed action be implemented, and alternatives to the proposed action.

The act also established the Council on Environmental Quality, which is charged with the implementation and oversight of the National Environmental Policy Act. The Council on Environmental Quality subsequently developed the legal requirements (40 Code of Federal Regulations 1500- 1508) that all federal agencies must follow in evaluating the environmental effects of proposed actions. These procedures involve three levels of documentation: categorical exclusions; environmental assessments; and environmental impact statements. In the National Park Service, construction activities, natural or cultural resource management projects, and park plans trigger the majority of National Environmental Policy Act documents. The National Environmental Policy Act enables the National Park Service to integrate compliance with other legal mandates and provides a format for public involvement. Director's Order 12 sets forth the policy and procedures by which the service will comply with the National Environmental Policy Act.

### **Clean Air Act**

The Clean Air Act provides a legal framework for the National Park Service to preserve and protect parks' air quality related values. The act establishes national ambient air quality standards for certain criteria pollutants. Major provisions of the act are intended to set a goal for cleaner air by setting national primary and secondary ambient air quality standards. Primary standards define levels of air quality necessary to protect public health, while secondary standards define levels necessary to protect public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effects of a pollutant.

Under the Clean Air Act, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is required to set new source performance standards, based on best- demonstrated technology and to establish national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is also required to develop programs for prevention of significant deterioration of air quality in attainment areas. Air pollution permits in attainment areas mandate installation of pollution controls that represent the best available control technology.

The Clean Air Act also requires states to develop and submit a state implementation plan for achieving national ambient air quality standards within each state. The state implementation plan must establish state air quality control regions and specify emission limits, schedules, and timetables for compliance from both stationary and mobile sources. The Clean Air Act requires federal facilities to comply with state air pollution requirements. The Clean Air Act reinforces the NPS Organic Act role as a protector of natural and cultural resources within the national park system. Under the Clean Air Act, the National Park Service is responsible



for protecting air quality within park unit boundaries, and for taking appropriate action to do so, when reviewing emission sources within and outside of the park system.

### Clean Water Act

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Clean Water Act and the Water Quality Act of 1987, forms the legal framework to support maintenance and restoration of water quality. The Clean Water Act establishes the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System as the regulatory mechanism to achieve water quality goals by regulating pollutant discharge to navigable streams, lakes, and rivers. Through standards promulgated by individual states, the Clean Water Act requires the NPS to protect its water resources from point and nonpoint sources of pollution. Many NPS construction activities are regulated by the Clean Water Act under stormwater permitting requirements.

### Endangered Species Act

The Endangered Species Act of 1973, amended in 1982 and 1987, is intended to prevent the further decline of endangered and threatened plant and animal species and to help in the restoration of populations of these species and their habitats. The Endangered Species Act, jointly administered by the Department of Commerce and the Department of the Interior, requires that each federal agency consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to determine whether endangered or threatened species are known to exist or have critical habitats on or in the vicinity of the site of a proposed action.

Section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act authorizes the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to review proposed major federal actions to assess the potential impacts to listed species. In accordance with Section 7 (c), the National Park Service, in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, must identify and promote the conservation of all federally listed species and their critical habitat within park boundaries.

### Executive Orders on Wetlands and Floodplains

Executive Order 11988, *Floodplain Management* (May 24, 1977), requires federal agencies to evaluate the potential effects of actions in floodplains to avoid adversely impacting floodplains wherever possible. Executive Order 11988 also requires federal agencies to ensure that planning programs and budget requests reflect consideration of flood hazards and floodplain management, including the restoration and preservation of such land areas as natural undeveloped floodplains, and to prescribe procedures to implement the policies and procedures of this executive order.

Executive Order 11990, *Protection of Wetlands* (May 24, 1977), requires federal agencies to take action to avoid adversely impacting wetlands wherever possible, to minimize wetlands destruction, and to preserve procedures to implement the policies and procedures of this executive order. It is the intent of these executive orders that, wherever possible, federal agencies implement the floodplains/wetlands requirements through existing procedures, such as those internal procedures established to implement National Environmental Policy Act. The National Park Service often integrates compliance with the executive orders with other legal mandates, such as National Environmental Policy Act.

### Wilderness Act

The Wilderness Act of 1964 established the National Wilderness Preservation System, composed of federal lands designated as wilderness areas. Wilderness areas are to be administered “for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such a manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness.” The law states that “the designation of any area of any park, monument, or other unit of the national park system as a wilderness area shall in no manner lower the standards evolved for the use and preservation of such park, monument, or other unit of the national park system.”

Except as specifically provided by law, permanent roads are prohibited within any wilderness area. Except as needed for administrative purposes, temporary roads or use of motorized vehicles or equipment are forbidden within any wilderness area.





The following exceptions are permitted: where the use of motorboats is already established, it may be permitted to continue subject to management restrictions; all wheelchairs, including motorized wheelchairs, are allowed in NPS wilderness areas; measures necessary to control fire, insects, and diseases may be taken; and certain mining activities are permitted.

### **Management Policies 2001**

This is the first update of Management Policies since 1988. The policies are derived from the laws that have been enacted to establish and govern the NPS and the National Park System. This document serves as the basic, Servicewide policy manual used by park superintendents and other NPS managers to guide their decision-making. The manual prescribes policies which enable the NPS to preserve park resources and values unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations, as required by law. The policies have been updated to keep pace with new laws that have been enacted, changes in technology and American demographics, and new understandings of the kinds of actions that are required to best protect the natural and cultural resources of the parks. The policies stress the importance of: using the parks for educational purposes; demonstrating environmental leadership in the parks; managing park facilities and resources in ways that will sustain them for future generations of Americans to enjoy; and working with partners to help accomplish the NPS mission. The new Management Policies is available on the NPS World Wide Web site at <http://www.nps.gov/refdesk/mp/index.html>.

### **Director's Order #12**

*Director's Order #12* describes the policy and procedures by which the National Park Service will comply with the National Environmental Policy Act. The Council on Environmental Quality, part of the Executive Office of the President, is the "caretaker" of National Environmental Policy Act. The National Park Service is required to abide by all National Environmental Policy Act regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations 1500- 1508) and any other procedures and requirements imposed by other higher authorities, such as the Department of the Interior.

### **Director's Order #28**

*Director's Order #28*, issued pursuant to 16 United States Code (1 through 4), addresses cultural resource management. The National Park Service will protect and manage cultural resources in its custody through effective research, planning, and stewardship and in accordance with the policies and principles contained in the National Park Service *Management Policies 2001*.

### **Ban on Personal Watercraft**

Personal watercraft use is a relatively new recreational activity that has been observed in approximately 32 of the 87 units of the national park system that allow motorized boating. The NPS is proposing regulations that will prohibit personal watercraft in units of the national park system unless the NPS determines that such use is appropriate for a specific unit based on that unit's enabling legislation, resources and values, other visitor uses, and overall management objectives.





Appendix Table B.1: Surface Water Quality Standards for the State of Georgia (Georgia Environmental Protection Division 2001)								
Fecal coliform standard (MPN/100 ml)				Dissolved Oxygen <sup>4</sup>		pH	Temperature <sup>4</sup>	
Use Classification	30- day geometric mean <sup>1/</sup> (MPN/100 ml)	Maximum (MPN/100 ml)	Standard <sup>1/</sup> if water quality and sanitary studies show fecal coliform levels from non-human sources occasionally exceed 200 col/100 ml	Daily Average (mg/l)	Min (mg/l)	Standard Units	Maximum Rise (F)	Maximum (F)
Drinking- Water Supplies	200 (May- October <sup>2/</sup> )	—	300 in lakes and reservoirs 500 in free flowing freshwater streams	5.0	4.0	6.0- 8.5	5	90
	1,000 (November- April)	4,000 (Nov- April)	Not applicable	5.0	4.0	6.0- 8.5	5	90
Recreation <sup>3/</sup>	100 (coastal waters)	—	Not applicable	5.0	4.0	6.0- 8.5	5	90
	200 (freshwater)	—	300 in lakes and reservoirs 500 in free flowing freshwater streams	5.0	4.0	6.0- 8.5	5	90
Fishing	200 (May- October <sup>2/</sup> )	—	300 in lakes and reservoirs 500 in free flowing freshwater streams	5.0	4.0	6.0- 8.5	5	90
	1,000 (November- April)	4,000 (Nov- April)	Not applicable	5.0	4.0	6.0- 8.5	5	90

<sup>1/</sup>Geometric mean based on at least four samples collected from a given sampling site over a 30- day period at intervals not less than 24 hours. The geometric mean of a series of N terms is the N<sup>th</sup> root of their product. Example: the geometric mean of 2 and 18 is the square root of 36.

<sup>2/</sup> May through October is the season when water contact recreation activities are expected to occur.

<sup>3/</sup> The state does not encourage swimming in surface waters, since a number of factors which are beyond the control of any state regulatory agency contribute to elevated levels of fecal coliform.



Appendix Table B.2: Streams within the CRNRA that are “Not Supporting” or “Only Partially Supporting” Their Designated Uses (From The 1998 Georgia Environmental Protection Division 305(b) Report for Areas within the CRNRA, in NPS 2000e):				
Location	Use Classification	Criterion Violated	Notes & Comments	Refs*
Chattahoochee River, below Buford Dam to Hwy 20	Recreation & drinking water	DO	(3 miles) Dam releases causing low DO, with biological impacts	94- 5 (N); 98 (N)
Chattahoochee River Hwy 20 to Hwy 141	Recreation & drinking water	FC, FCG	(15 miles) Urban runoff effects	98 (P)
Chattahoochee River Hwy 141 to Hwy 19	Recreation & drinking water	FC, FCG	(13 miles) Urban runoff effects	98 (P)
Chattahoochee River Hwy 19 to I- 285	Recreation & drinking water	FC, FCG	(11 miles) Urban runoff effects	94- 5 (N); 98 (N)
Chattahoochee River I- 285 to Peachtree Creek	Recreation & drinking water	FC (94- 5) FC, FCG (98)	(6 miles) Urban runoff effects	94- 5 (N); 98 (N)
Ball Mill Creek Fulton/DeKalb Counties	Fishing	FC (98)	(3 miles) Urban runoff effects	94- 5 (N); 98 (N)
Big Creek Fulton County	Fishing & drinking water	FC	(5 miles) Urban runoff effects	94- 5 (P)
Crooked Creek, Gwinnett County	Fishing	FC	(2 miles) Urban runoff effects	94- 5 (N); 98 (N)
James Creek Forsyth County	Fishing	FC	(2 miles) Non- point runoff. Watershed protection needed.	94- 5 (N)
Johns Creek Fulton County	Fishing	FC	(4 miles) Urban runoff effects	94- 5 (N); 98 (N)
Level Creek, Gwinnett County	Fishing	FC	(5 miles) Urban runoff effects	94- 5 (N); 98 (N)
Long Island Creek Fulton County	Fishing	FC	(5 miles) Urban runoff effects	94- 5 (N); 98 (N)
March Creek Fulton County	Fishing	FC	(4 miles) Urban runoff effects	94- 5 (N); 98 (N)
Hog Waller Creek (into Big Creek, Roswell)	Fishing	FC	(4 miles) Urban runoff effects	98 (P)
Richland Creek Gwinnett County	Fishing	FC	(5 miles) Urban runoff effects	94- 5 (N); 98 (N)
Rottenwood Creek Cobb County	Fishing	FC, Pb	(9 miles) Urban runoff effects	94- 5 (N); 98 (N)
Sope Creek Cobb County	Fishing	FC, Pb	(11 miles) Urban runoff effects	94- 5 (N); 98 (N)
Sope Creek, a tributary to Cobb County	Fishing	Cd, Cu, Pb	(1 mile) Urban runoff effects	98 (P)
Suwanee Creek Gwinnett County	Fishing	FC	(4 miles) Non- point and urban runoff	94- 5 (N); 98 (N)
Willeo Creek Cobb/Fulton Counties	Fishing	FC, Pb	(5 miles) Urban runoff effects	94- 5 (N); 98 (N)

Refs = References which refer to the non- support: “94- 5” = Georgia Environmental Protection Division, 1996, *Water quality in Georgia*.

“98” = Georgia Environmental Protection Division, 1998, *Georgia 1998 lists of water as required by the Section 303(d) of the Fed. Clean Water Act*. N = not supporting designated uses; P = partially supporting designated uses; FC = fecal coliforms; DO = dissolved oxygen; FCG = fish consumption guidelines; Pb = lead; Cd = cadmium; Cu = copper.



## **APPENDIX C**

### **ISSUES ANALYSIS**

#### **Cost Analysis Tables Choosing By Advantages Summary Tables**



Appendix Table C-1: Summary of Issues Identified During Public Scoping of the Chattahoochee River GMP/EIS.

	Issue		Things NPS Can't Do	Things NPS Must Do	Might/ GMP	Might (Other Types of Plans)	Not Planning Issue)
Summary Concern	Category						
<b>ACCESS</b>							
2. Fences that go into the river adjacent to parks blocks some river access (Question: what are legal jurisdictions for river proper - river bottoms, banks, bottoms? Answer - Only if blocking access - floating - in the river)	I						X
12. River access needed at all public areas	I				X		
56. Multi-use access	I				X		
78. Keep the river unrestricted to fishing, and boaters (i.e. canoes, rafts)	I	II			X		
80. Create a corridor to connect each park unit	I				X		
140. Boat launching points are needed at Hwy. 141 bridge, Jones Bridge, Holcomb Bridge	I				X		
149. Improve angler access and temperatures in the river below Morgan Falls	I				X		
<b>FACILITY NEEDS</b>							
3. Need for restrooms (Medlock Bridge Unit)(Note - we lumped all restroom comments as GMP)	2				X		
4. Install parking meters	2						X
42. Provide more restroom facilities within a close walking distance to the river, and include signs along river that indicate restroom location	2				X		
106. Keep the exercise stations at Cochran Shoals	2				X		
107. Create a visitor's center or central location for visitor to gather (Visitor center - HQ - individual offices outside the park)	2				X		
113. Improve bathroom facilities at Powers Island	2				X		
114. Bathrooms are needed at Columns Drive	2				X		
121. Racks to lock bikes where park units are accessible by bicycle	2						
125. Picnic tables and trash cans at each unit	2				X		
127. Facilities at park units should be more "green" by using solar power, recycled goods, etc.	2					X	
146. Install a restroom facility and information board at Bowman's Island unit	2				X		
177. Keep restrooms and other facilities cleaner	2						X
182. Implement a recycling program (cans, plastic, etc.)	2						X
<b>ECOLOGICAL</b>							
1. How much vegetation will the U.S. Forest Service (assume the commentor meant National Park Service) clear adjacent to McGinnis Ferry Road? (Pine Plantation adjacent to McGinnis)					X		
5. Preserve and protect the natural environment	3	4		X			
11. Protect wildlife species	1			X			
52. Protect the natural beauty of the CRNRA for all to enjoy	7			X			
90. Install bird boxes with predator guards in park area to encourage breeding	3						X
91. Provide for a wildlife sanctuary	3			X			
97. Increase river and tributary buffers	5				X		
129. Critical Protection Zones should be identified in ecologically sensitive areas	5				X		
134. Maintain insect diversity and population	3			X			
148. Seed wildflowers within the park	5		X				
156. Maintain the park's natural setting	5				X		
158. Identify native species in the park and manage to maximize their biodiversity	3			X			

Appendix Table C-1: Summary of Issues Identified During Public Scoping of the Chattahoochee River GMP/EIS.

	Issue		Things NPS Can't Do	Things NPS Must Do	Might/ GMP	Might (Other Types of Plans)	Not Planning Issue)
Summary Concern	Category						
<b>IMPACTS (Note: if within regulatory arena)(Impairment?)</b>							
7. Protect environment from noise	4	12		X			
8. Protect environment from pollution (i.e. sewage spills, dumping, non-point source pollution, animal feces contamination)	4	12		X			
9. Protect environment from erosion	4	12		X			
10. Protect fish habitat	4	12			X		
40. Construct catch basins on streams entering the river	11					X	
41. Increase the number of releases from Buford Dam (coordinate with other agencies - COE on the releases)	4				X		
67. Monitor river quality and publish test results for public view	4	8				X	
71. Monitor and report fecal coliform levels in the river	4					X	
101. Do not allow siphoning of river water to float barges	4	5				X	
102. Stop additional sewage disposal into (Lake Lanier) and the Chattahoochee	4				X		
111. Limit impervious surface in the park	4					X	
128. GMP should include goals for protecting water quantity (draw on Tri-State)	4					X	
133. Eliminate sources of siltation, stormwater discharge, and (enforce the Clean Water Act - this is how we interpreted) other pollutants	4			X			
<b>USE</b>							
6. Limit development	5				X		
13. Prohibit motorized craft from access to waters	5	1			X		
14. Allow unrestricted access to non-motorized craft	5	1			X		
26. Keep motorized vehicles out of park area	5				X		
27. Designate the park a quiet wildlife area	5				X		
30. Restrict development within a barrier around the park	5		X				
54. Provide paved areas for rollerbladers/skaters	5				X		
64. Enforce leash and pet cleanup laws	5			X			
66. Preserve greenspace	5				X		
75. Preserve land around the river for "people use"	5				X		
82. Safety concerns for children	5		X				
87. Stop carnival activities that the current concessioner is permitting	5				X		
88. Less corporate usage/parties	5				X		
89. More boat rentals above Morgan Falls, and along Johnson Ferry areas I and II	5				X		
104. Off-leash areas for dogs to swim (Note- need clarification on dog policy) (36 CFR 2.15)	5		X				
105. Fenced area for dogs to play	5					X	
108. Dogs should be confined to designated walking paths located away from tributaries	5					X	
110. Build a playground at Columns Drive	5				X		
119. Release water in the evening between 6:30 and 8:30 p.m.	5					X	
130. A visitor carrying capacity should be identified	5				X		
138. Commercial and non-commercial whitewater kayak and canoe instruction	5					X	
144. Do not allow dogs in Cochran Shoals	5				X		
153. The park should change the "recreation" focus to wildlife sanctuary	5				X		
174. Limit/oppose construction of soccer fields and other athletic fields	5				X		
176. Develop better and less expensive system for renewal/decals (wanted removable stickers to interchange between vehicles)	5						X
178. Concessionaire operating permits for outside persons/organizations	5					X	
179. Increase public safety	5					X	
181. Create "whitewater" park near adjacent park units	5		X				

Appendix Table C-1: Summary of Issues Identified During Public Scoping of the Chattahoochee River GMP/EIS.

Summary Concern	Issue Category		Things NPS Can't Do	Things NPS Must Do	Might/ GMP	Might (Other Types of Plans)	Not Planning Issue)
<b>BOUNDARIES</b>							
15. Expand the CRNRA land holdings (Good basis for decision point)	6				X		
32. Extend the park to South Fulton and Douglas Counties	6				X		
60. Expand the park boundaries	6				X		
85. Secure property along the river where development has not occurred	6				X		
100. NPS should acquire the full 10,000 acres which it has been authorized	6				X		
168. Extend the park boundaries north toward Helen	6				X		
<b>TRAILS</b>							
16. Develop more well-designed mountain bike trails	7				X		
18. Limit access to river via hiking trails only	7				X		
28. Interconnected mountain bike trail system	7				X		
29. Interconnected mountain biking and hiking trails	7				X		
34. Fix and maintain eroded mountain bike trails	7					X	
35. Create separate trails for different trail users	7				X		
39. Construct a continuous through-hiking trail following the river	7				X		
43. Develop and implement a simple system of trail marking	7					X	
44. Lack of mountain bike trails is a personal concern	7				X		
45. Use public right-of-way lands along the river to connect mountain bike and hiking trails	7				X		
46. The National Park Service should work with the Southern Off-Road Bicycle Association (S.O.R.B.A.) and the Roswell-Alpharetta Mountain Biking Organization (R.A.M.B.O.) to develop, build and maintain mountain bike or multi-use trails	7					X	
47. Increase access to mountain bikers to more park units	7				X		
48. Construct a bike lane along the length of the river	7				X		
49. Install a single-track mountain bike trail at Sope Creek	7				X		
50. Create wilderness trails along the river	7				X		
51. Establish land conservation and responsibility measures, such as allowing users to "adopt" certain portions of the wilderness or trail areas	7					X	
53. Expand and upgrade current walking, hiking, and biking trails with designated rest areas	7				X		
59. Build longer and additional trails	7				X		
61. Provide easier access to pedestrians between park units via pedestrian-specific pathways	7	1			X		
70. Designate a certain amount of impervious surface for biking	7					X	
73. Monitor and report on mountain bike usage, use field surveys	7					X	
77. Need additional sight-seeing trails	7				X		
81. Add a bike wash station in designated biking areas	7						X
94. Prohibit all non-pedestrian traffic on trails	7				X		
112. Use alternating days for multi-use trails	7					X	
120. Road bike lanes throughout park	7				X		
122. Open more units to mountain bikes, such as the Gold Branch	7				X		
126. Flag or mark all trails	7					X	
135. Update trail maps	7	8				X	
136. Improve trail markings	7					X	
154. Open Vickery Creek to mountain biking	7				X		
157. Build sidewalk entrances to parks to increase pedestrian access (connectivity - assumed instead of sidewalk)	7				X		
160. Construct bike trails in already disturbed areas	7				X		
161. Connect trails for hiking and biking throughout the park	7				X		
175. Limit amount of developed trails	7				X		

Appendix Table C-1: Summary of Issues Identified During Public Scoping of the Chattahoochee River GMP/EIS.

Summary Concern	Issue Category		Things NPS Can't Do	Things NPS Must Do	Might/ GMP	Might (Other Types of Plans)	Not Planning Issue)
<b>OUTREACH</b>							
17. Increase communication and relationships between the Park Service and other agencies and stakeholders	8				X		
19. Need for environmental education common to all alternatives; process to accomplish the goal(s)	8					X	
20. Need for an environmental education center (i.e. Geosphere)	8					X	
37. Advertise public meetings better	8					X	
38. Need to have programs that encourage public participation on river clean-up	8					X	
55. The NPS needs to have town hall meetings for residents to discuss plans that would most benefit their community	8					X	
57. Use volunteers for trail maintenance	8						X
63. Use vandal-resistant cases to house park maps	8						X
68. Involve more community groups and stakeholders in river efforts (i.e., Trout Unlimited, etc.)	8					X	
69. Increase communication between federal government and state agencies	8				X		
74. Increase public awareness via the Internet, and a high-quality website for the CRNRA	8					X	
76. Schedule volunteer "work days" with the community	8						X
79. Implement an educational outreach and awareness campaign	8					X	
92. Encourage trips for inner-city youth to the park	8					X	
93. More training programs for teachers and volunteers	8					X	
95. Add clerical assistance to Geosphere Center	8						X
109. Place educational signs in the park	8					X	
132. Take down trail maps posted in park and replace with directional signs	8					X	
147. The park should offer group walks and interpretive programs to help educate the public	8					X	
152. Post signs for gate closing times	8						X
164. Prisoners should participate in community service activities on river such as river clean-ups	8						X
165. River needs more detailed maps depicting river depths and elevations	8						X
166. Have fundraisers for the park	8						X
172. NPS should maintain administrative control of CRNRA, do not allow control to go to outside private companies/organizations	8			X			
180. Increase wages for Park Rangers	8						X
183. Include any county and state parks on general location map(s) of the CRNA/RA	8					X	
<b>PRIVATE PROPERTY</b>							
24. Opposition to development of public access or recreational facilities through private property	9	1	X				
25. Opposition to any impact on existing residential property (use could affect privacy)	9					X	
83. Privacy for homeowners on or near the park	9					X	
84. Will the homeowner's property value change with different uses of the park?	9						X
99. Tax cut incentives for private and corporate landowners who donate or sell land	9						X
<b>TRANSIT</b>							
22. Improve parking facilities	2	10			X		
23. Designate parking areas away from river	10				X		
36. Not enough parking at Cochran Shoals	10				X		
86. Traffic and safety issues are a concern around the Johnson Ferry and Columns Drive area	10					X	
137. Better shuttle bus system	10				X		
143. Enlarge and repave Columns Drive parking lot	10				X		
167. Improve parking and road to Settles Bridge access area	10				X		

Appendix Table C-1: Summary of Issues Identified During Public Scoping of the Chattahoochee River GMP/EIS.

Summary Concern	Issue Category		Things NPS Can't Do	Things NPS Must Do	Might/ GMP	Might (Other Types of Plans)	Not Planning Issue)
<b>FISHERIES / FISHING</b>							
21. Stop illegal fishing on river	II			X			
58. Designate catch and release trout fishing areas	II					X	
72. Monitor and report on fish populations	II						X
116. Increase stocking of river with larger fish	II					X	
117. Reduce the limit of fish that can be taken out	II					X	
124. Create spawning habitat for fish	II		X				
139. Designate sections of the river for catch and release, and fly fishing only	II					X	
141. Barbless, single hooks on river north of Roswell Road	II					X	
142. Catch and release fishing between Hwy. 20 to Buford Dam	II					X	?
145. Establish a section of river for trophy trout fishing	II					X	
150. Establish flow rates to protect trout fisheries	II		X				
151. Implement a delayed harvest program with special emphasis on East Palisades/Whitewater Creek	II					X	
162. Establish a "no kill" section between Morgan Falls and Buford Dam, should be catch and release only	II					X	
171. Increase the awareness/education of " State Fish Consumption Guidelines" to fisherman						X	
<b>ENFORCEMENT</b>							
33. Enforce stricter penalties for polluters and violators of environmental laws	12						X
62. Use citizens to accompany rangers in problem identification in the park (i.e. the "second pair of eyes" theory)	12						X
65. Increase the presence of rangers within the units	12	8			X		
96. Establish a position with the sole responsibility in conjunction with local and state agencies to monitor the enforcement of environmental laws along the river	12					X	
103. Stronger and more effective enforcement of clean water laws	12					X	
115. Bicycle patrols are needed at Columns Drive	12					X	
118. Check fishing licenses more frequently	12					X	
123. Enforce the Metropolitan River Protection Act and adhere to the Chattahoochee Corridor Plan	12						X
155. Stronger zoning enforcement	12		X			X	
163. Place phones at certain areas in the park for fisherman to report poachers	12						X
169. Regulatory enforcement should include tributaries of the Chattahoochee							X
170. Increase protection of Historic Resources in Park areas					X		
173. Enforcement of parking fines (observes many cars going "unfined" while using park facilities)	12						X
<b>RESTORATION</b>							
98. Exotic plant eradication	13				X		
131. Goals should be established for restoring damaged areas	13				X		
159. Staff a restoration ecologist	13					X	
31. The Atlanta Regional Commission should focus their environmental efforts on big polluters, like the City of Atlanta and large corporate violators	NA		X				



Appendix Table C-1: Summary of Issues Identified During Public Scoping of the Chattahoochee River GMP/EIS.

	Issue		Things NPS Can't Do	Things NPS Must Do	Might/ GMP	Might (Other Types of Plans)	Not Planning Issue)
Summary Concern	Category						
Key to Issue Categories:							
NA Not Applicable							
1. Access (River or general)							
2 Facility Needs							
3 Ecological							
4 Impacts							
5 Use							
6 Boundaries							
7 Trails							
8 Outreach							
9 Private Property							
10 Transit							
11 Fisheries/Fishing							
12 Enforcement							
13 Restoration							

Appendix Table C-2. Impact Topics, Impact Thresholds, and Corresponding Issues Identified During Scoping.

Primary Impact Topic	Impact Thresholds	Corresponding GMP Issue Identified During Scoping (Appendix Table C-1)
Air quality	Negligible adverse: Effects of air quality from emission sources in the area surrounding the park are not detectable and would have no discernable effect on natural resources or visitor experience in the park	5, 6, 8, 13, 26
	Minor adverse: Effects of air quality from sources in the area surrounding the park are slightly detectable and are not expected to have an overall effect on natural resources or visitor experience in the park	
	Moderate adverse: Effects of air quality from sources in the area surrounding the park are clearly detectable and could have an appreciable effect on air natural resources or visitor experience inside the park	
	Major adverse: Effects of air quality from sources in the area surrounding the park are substantial and could have a highly noticeable effect on natural resources or visitor experience inside the park	
	Negligible adverse: Effects of air quality from emission sources in the park are not detectable and would have no discernable effect on air quality in the area	8, 6, 30
	Minor adverse: Effects of air quality from sources in the park are slightly detectable and are not expected to have an overall effect on air quality in the area	
	Moderate adverse: Effects of air quality from sources in park are clearly detectable and could have an appreciable effect on air quality in the area	
	Major adverse: Effects of air quality from sources in the park are substantial and could have a highly noticeable effect on air quality in the area	
Surface Water Quality	Negligible adverse: Effects of runoff on surface water quality of the streams inside the park are not detectable	8, 9, 10, 67, III, 128, 133, 6
	Minor adverse: Effects on surface water quality of the streams inside the park are slightly detectable with no overall change	
	Moderate adverse: Effects of runoff on streams inside the park are clearly detectable and are expected to have an appreciable effect on surface water quality	
	Major adverse: Effects of runoff on streams inside the park are substantial and highly noticeable, and are expected to have a permanent effect on surface water quality	
	Negligible beneficial: Implementation of management plans and best management practices improves water quality in a very small area. Overall effect is detectable, but very small	
	Minor beneficial: Implementation of management plans and best management practices improves water quality in a small area inside the park. Overall effect is clearly detectable.	
	Moderate beneficial: Implementation of management plans and best management practices improves water quality in a several small areas inside the park. Overall effect is clearly detectable.	
	Major beneficial: Implementation of management plans and best management practices improves water quality in a several small areas and/or several large areas inside the park. Overall effect is clearly detectable.	
	Negligible adverse: Effects of runoff caused by increased visitor use on surface water quality of the streams inside the park are not detectable	8, 9, 10, 67, III, 128, 133, 34
	Minor adverse: Effects on surface water quality of the streams inside the park caused by increased visitor use are slightly detectable with no overall change	
	Moderate adverse: Effects of runoff on streams inside the park caused by increased visitor use are clearly detectable and are expected to have an appreciable effect on surface water quality	
	Major adverse: Effects of runoff on streams inside the park caused by increased visitor use are substantial and highly noticeable, and are expected to have a permanent effect on surface water quality	
	Negligible beneficial: Implementation of management plans and best management practices improves water quality in a very small area. Overall effect is detectable, but very small	
	Minor beneficial: Implementation of management plans and best management practices improves water quality in a small area inside the park. Overall effect is clearly detectable.	

Appendix Table C-2. Impact Topics, Impact Thresholds, and Corresponding Issues Identified During Scoping.

Primary Impact Topic	Impact Thresholds	Corresponding GMP Issue Identified During Scoping (Appendix Table C-1)
	Moderate beneficial: Implementation of management plans and best management practices improves water quality in a several small areas inside the park. Overall effect is clearly detectable.	
	Major beneficial: Implementation of management plans and best management practices improves water quality in a several small areas and/or several large areas inside the park. Overall effect is clearly detectable.	8, 9, 10, 67, 111, 128, 133
	Negligible adverse: effects of nonpoint surface runoff from the development in the surrounding area on water quality of streams in the park are not detectable	
	Minor adverse: effects of nonpoint surface runoff from the development in the surrounding area on water quality of streams in the park are slightly detectable with no overall change	
	Moderate adverse: effects of nonpoint surface runoff from the development in the surrounding area on water quality of streams in the park are clearly detectable and are expected to have an appreciable effect on surface water quality	
	Major adverse: effects of nonpoint surface runoff from the development in the surrounding area on water quality of streams in the park are substantial and highly noticeable, and are expected to have a permanent effect on surface water quality	
	Negligible beneficial: Implementation of management plans and best management practices improves water quality in a very small area. Overall effect is detectable, but very small	5, 8, 9, 11, 52, 91, 97, 129, 134, 158, 156, 10, 133
	Minor beneficial: Implementation of management plans and best management practices improves water quality in a small area inside the park. Overall effect is clearly detectable.	
	Moderate beneficial: Implementation of management plans and best management practices improves water quality in a several small areas inside the park. Overall effect is clearly detectable.	
	Major beneficial: Implementation of management plans and best management practices improves water quality in a several small areas and/or several large areas inside the park. Overall effect is clearly detectable.	
	Major adverse: effects of nonpoint surface runoff from the development in the surrounding area on aquatic ecology of the Chattahoochee River are substantial and highly noticeable, and are expected to have a permanent effect on surface water quality	
Wetlands and Floodplains	Negligible adverse: Impacts on wetlands due to filling activities are perceptible and can be measured; and are highly localized and confined to a single limited area. Mitigation would result in offsetting acreage, functions and values of affected wetlands.	
	Minor adverse: Effects on wetlands due to filling activities are measurable and perceptible, and occur at more than one location. Overall effect is still within a very small area. Mitigation would result in offsetting acreage, functions and values of affected wetlands.	
	Negligible beneficial: Implementation of management plans and best management practices, and addition of new park areas protects measurable and perceptible areas of wetlands at only one location. Overall effect is still within a very small area.	
	Minor beneficial: Implementation of management plans and best management practices, and addition of new park areas protects measurable and perceptible areas of wetlands at more than one location. Overall effect is still within a very small area.	5, 52, 97, 129, 156, 8, 9
	Moderate adverse: Effects on wetlands due to filling activities at several small sites or a larger area at a single location. Mitigation would result in offsetting acreage, functions and values of affected wetlands.	
	Moderate beneficial: Implementation of management plans and best management practices, and addition of new park areas protects several small wetlands or a larger wetland at a single location.	
	Major adverse: Effects on wetlands due to filling activities at numerous locations of larger size, or effects on a single large wetland. Mitigation would result in offsetting acreage, functions and values of affected wetlands.	

Appendix Table C-2. Impact Topics, Impact Thresholds, and Corresponding Issues Identified During Scoping.

Primary Impact Topic	Impact Thresholds	Corresponding GMP Issue Identified During Scoping (Appendix Table C-1)
	Major beneficial: Implementation of management plans and best management practices, and addition of new park areas protects wetlands at numerous locations of larger size, or a single large wetland.	
	Negligible adverse: Impacts on floodplains due to filling activities are perceptible and can be measured; and are highly localized and confined to a single limited area.	
	Minor adverse: Effects on floodplains due to filling activities are measurable and perceptible, and occur at more than one location. Overall effect is still within a very small area.	
	Minor beneficial: Implementation of management plans and best management practices, and addition of new park areas protects measurable and perceptible areas of floodplains at more than one location. Overall effect is still within a very small area.	5, 11, 52, 91, 129, 156, 8, 9, 10, 133, 60, 6
	Moderate adverse: Effects on floodplains due to filling activities at several small sites or a larger area at a single location.	
	Moderate beneficial: Implementation of management plans and best management practices, and addition of new park areas protects several small floodplain areas or a larger section of floodplain at a single location.	
	Major adverse: Effects on wetlands and floodplains due to filling activities at numerous locations of larger size, or effects on a single large floodplain area.	
	Major beneficial: Implementation of management plans and best management practices, and addition of new park areas protects floodplains at numerous locations of larger size, or a single large floodplain area.	1, 5, 11, 52, 91, 129, 156, 158, 8, 9, 10
	Negligible adverse: Impacts on floodplains and wetlands due to runoff from the area surrounding the park are perceptible and can be measured; and are highly localized and confined to a single limited area.	
	Minor adverse: Impacts on floodplains and wetlands due to runoff from the area surrounding the park are measurable and perceptible, and occur at more than one location. Overall effect is still within a very small area.	
	Moderate adverse: Impacts on floodplains and wetlands due to runoff from the area surrounding the park area affects several small sites or a larger area at a single location.	
	Major adverse: Impacts on floodplains and wetlands due to runoff from the area surrounding the park area affects numerous locations of larger size, or effects on a single large floodplain area.	
Rare, Threatened and Endangered Species	Negligible adverse: Plan implementation would have no effect on state- or federally-listed species of plants and animals or designated critical habitat.	
	Minor adverse: Adverse impacts on state- or federally- listed species of plants and animals or designated critical habitat would probably not occur or be meaningfully measured or detected. The resource may be affected, but is unlikely to be affected.	
	Minor beneficial: Addition of new park areas protects measurable and perceptible areas of protected species habitat at more than one location. Overall effect is still within a very small area.	1, 5, 11, 52, 91, 129, 156, 158, 8, 9
	Moderate adverse: Adverse impacts on state- or federally- listed species of plants and animals or designated critical habitat would result in a local population decline due to reduced survivorship and/or a shift in distribution of the species. The resource may be affected, and is likely to be adversely affected.	
	Moderate beneficial: Addition of new park areas protects several small areas of protected species habitat or a larger section of habitat at a single location.	
	Major adverse: Adverse effects could jeopardize the continued existence of a state- or federally- listed species of plant or animal or adversely modify a designated critical habitat so that direct causality or mortality would occur. The continued existence of a protected species would likely be jeopardized or a critical habitat would be adversely modified.	
	Major beneficial: Addition of new park areas protects protected species habitat at numerous locations of larger size, or a single large area. Large areas or may be restored.	

Appendix Table C-2. Impact Topics, Impact Thresholds, and Corresponding Issues Identified During Scoping.

Primary Impact Topic	Impact Thresholds	Corresponding GMP Issue Identified During Scoping (Appendix Table C-1)
Terrestrial Ecological Resources - Deciduous forests	Negligible adverse: No native forests would be affected, or some individual trees or other native vegetation would be affected as a result of plan implementation, but there would no effect on species composition. Effects would be short-term and small scale.	
	Minor adverse: Would effect some individual native trees or other vegetation but overall, would affect only a minor part of the total population. Mitigation to offset impacts would be required and would be effective.	
	Minor beneficial: Addition of new park areas protects measurable and perceptible areas of deciduous forest at more than one location. Overall effect is still within a very small area. Some small areas can be restored.	5, 11, 52, 91, 129, 156, 158, 8, 9
	Moderate adverse: Would affect some individual native trees and other vegetation and would also affect a sizeable segment of the specie's population and over a relatively large area. Mitigation to offset adverse effects could be extensive but would probably be successful.	
	Moderate beneficial: Addition of new park areas protects several small areas of deciduous forest or a larger section of terrestrial habitat at a single location. Numerous areas may be restored.	
	Major adverse: Effects would have a considerable long-term effect on deciduous forest and would affect a relatively large area. Mitigation measures to offset adverse impacts would be required and would be extensive. Success of mitigation would not be guaranteed and would only be deemed successful after a long period of monitoring.	
	Major beneficial: Addition of new park areas protects deciduous forest habitat at numerous locations of larger size, or a single large area. Large areas or may be restored.	
Terrestrial Ecological Resources - Other Native Wildlife	Negligible adverse: No native wildlife would be affected, or some individual species would be affected as a result of plan implementation, but there would no effect on species composition. Effects would be short-term and small scale.	
	Minor adverse: Would affect some individual wildlife but overall would affect only a minor part of the total population. Mitigation to offset impacts would be required and would be effective.	
	Minor beneficial: Addition of new park areas would have a beneficial effect on some individual wildlife but overall would only provide improved conditions for a minor part of the total population	8, 9, 6
	Moderate adverse: Would affect some individual wildlife and would also affect a sizeable segment of the specie's population and over a relatively large area. Mitigation to offset adverse effects could be extensive but would probably be successful.	
	Moderate beneficial: Addition of new park areas would have a beneficial effect on some individual wildlife species and would also benefit a sizeable segment of the specie's population and over a relatively large area.	
	Major adverse: Effects would have a considerable long-term effect on native wildlife and would affect a relatively large area. Mitigation measures to offset adverse impacts would be required and would be extensive. Success of mitigation would not be guaranteed and would only be deemed successful after a long period of monitoring.	
	Major beneficial: Addition of new park areas would have a considerable long-term positive effect on native wildlife over a relatively large area.	8, 9, 6
Prime and Unique Farmlands	Negligible adverse: Effects of construction on prime and unique farmlands are not detectable	
	Minor adverse: Effects of construction on prime and unique farmlands are slightly detectable with no overall change	
	Moderate adverse: Effects of construction on are expected to have an appreciable effect on prime and unique farmlands	

Appendix Table C-2. Impact Topics, Impact Thresholds, and Corresponding Issues Identified During Scoping.

Primary Impact Topic	Impact Thresholds	Corresponding GMP Issue Identified During Scoping (Appendix Table C-1)
	Major adverse: Effects of runoff on the prime and unique farmlands are substantial and highly noticeable, and are expected to have a permanent effect	5, 52, 156, 8, 170
	Negligible adverse: Impacts on prime and unique farmlands due to development in the area surrounding the park are perceptible and can be measured; and are highly localized and confined to a single limited area.	
	Minor adverse: Impacts on prime and unique farmlands due to development in the area surrounding the park are measurable and perceptible, and occur at more than one location. Overall effect is still within a very small area.	
	Moderate adverse: Impacts on prime and unique farmlands due to development in the area surrounding the park affects several small sites or a larger area at a single location.	
	Major adverse: Impacts on prime and unique farmlands due to development in the area surrounding the park affects numerous locations of larger size, or effects on a single large floodplain area.	
Cultural Resources - Archeological Resources	Negligible adverse: Impact is at the lowest levels of detection - barely measurable with no perceptible consequences, either adverse or beneficial, to archeological resources. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be <i>no adverse effect</i> .	
	Minor adverse: disturbance of a site(s) results in little, if any, loss of the site(s) significance or integrity and the site's National Register eligibility is unaffected. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be <i>adverse effect</i> .	
	Minor beneficial: maintenance and preservation of a site(s). For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be <i>no adverse effect</i> .	5, 52, 156, 8, 170
	Moderate adverse: disturbance of the site(s) does not diminish the significance or integrity of the site(s) to the extent that its National Register eligibility is jeopardized. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be <i>adverse effect</i> .	
	Moderate beneficial: stabilization of the site(s). For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be <i>no adverse effect</i> .	
	Major adverse impact: disturbance of the site(s) diminishes the significance and integrity of the site(s) to the extent that it is no longer eligible to be listed in the National Register. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be <i>adverse effect</i> .	
	Major beneficial: active intervention to preserve the sites. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be <i>no adverse effect</i> .	
Cultural Resources - Historical Buildings, Structures and Objects	Negligible adverse: Impact(s) is at the lowest levels of detection - barely perceptible and not measurable. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be <i>no adverse effect</i> .	
	Minor adverse: impact would not affect the character defining features of a National Register of Historic Places eligible or listed structure, building, or object. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be <i>no adverse effect</i> .	
	Minor beneficial: stabilization/ preservation of character defining features in accordance with the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> , to maintain existing integrity of a structure, building, or object. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be <i>no adverse effect</i> .	5, 52, 156, 8
	Moderate adverse - impact would alter a character defining feature(s) of the structure, building, or object but would not diminish the integrity of the resource to the extent that its National Register eligibility is jeopardized. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be <i>no adverse effect</i> .	
	Moderate beneficial- rehabilitation of a structure or building in accordance with the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> , to make possible a compatible use of the property while preserving its character defining features. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be <i>no adverse effect</i> .	

Appendix Table C-2. Impact Topics, Impact Thresholds, and Corresponding Issues Identified During Scoping.

Primary Impact Topic	Impact Thresholds	Corresponding GMP Issue Identified During Scoping (Appendix Table C-1)
	Major adverse - impact would alter a character defining feature(s) of the structure, building, or object, diminishing the integrity of the resource to the extent that it is no longer eligible to be listed in the National Register. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be <i>adverse effect</i> .	
	Major beneficial- restoration in accordance with the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> , to accurately depict the form, features, and character of a structure or building as it appeared during its period of significance. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be <i>no adverse effect</i> .	
Cultural Resources - Properties of Traditional, Religious, and Cultural Significance	Negligible: Impact(s) would be barely perceptible and would neither alter resource conditions, such as traditional access or site preservation, nor the relationship between the resource and the affiliated group's body of beliefs and practices. There would be no change to a group's body of beliefs and practices. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect on TCPs would be <i>no adverse effect</i> .	
	Minor adverse - impact(s) would be slight but noticeable but would neither appreciably alter resource conditions, such as traditional access or site preservation, nor the relationship between the resource and the affiliated group's body of beliefs and practices. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect on TCPs would be <i>no adverse effect</i> .	
	Minor beneficial - would allow traditional access and/or accommodate a group's traditional practices or beliefs. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect on TCPs would be <i>no adverse effect</i> .	5, 52, 156, 8, 170
	Moderate adverse - impact(s) would be apparent and would alter resource conditions. Something would interfere with traditional access, site preservation, or the relationship between the resource and the affiliated group's beliefs and practices, even though the group's beliefs and practices would survive. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect on TCPs would be <i>adverse effect</i> .	
	Moderate beneficial - would facilitate traditional access to accommodate a group's practices and beliefs. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect on TCPs would be <i>no adverse effect</i> .	
	Major adverse: impact(s) would alter resource conditions. Something would block or greatly affect traditional access, site preservation, or the relationship between the resource and the affiliated group's body of beliefs and practices, to the extent that the survival of a group's beliefs and/or practices would be jeopardized. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect on TCPs would be <i>adverse effect</i> .	
	Major beneficial: would encourage traditional access to accommodate a group's practices and beliefs. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect on TCPs would be <i>no adverse effect</i> .	
Local and Regional Transportation	Negligible adverse: a change in local and regional transportation features that would not be detectable and would have no discernable effect on the park resources and values	
	Minor adverse: a change in local and regional transportation features that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an overall effect on the park resources and values	
	Moderate adverse: a change in local and regional transportation features that would be clearly detectable and could have an appreciable effect on the park resources and values	12, 56, 7, 8, 9, 130, 22, 23, 36, 86, 137, 143, 167, 173
	Major adverse: a substantial and noticeable effect on of local and regional transportation features that could permanently alter park resources and values	
	Negligible adverse: a change that would not be detectable and would have no discernable effect on visitor use of paved and unpaved trails	
	Minor adverse: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an overall effect on visitor use of paved and unpaved trails	

Appendix Table C-2. Impact Topics, Impact Thresholds, and Corresponding Issues Identified During Scoping.

Primary Impact Topic	Impact Thresholds	Corresponding GMP Issue Identified During Scoping (Appendix Table C-1)
	Minor beneficial: a change that would be slightly detectable and would not be expected to have an overall minor beneficial effect on visitor use of paved and unpaved trails	16, 18, 28, 29, 34, 35, 39, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 59, 61, 70, 73, 77, 81, 94, 112, 120, 122, 126, 135, 136, 154, 157, 160, 161, 175
	Moderate adverse: a change that would be clearly detectable and could have an appreciable adverse effect on visitor use of paved and unpaved trails	
	Moderate beneficial: a change that would be clearly detectable and could have an appreciable beneficial effect on visitor use of paved and unpaved trails	
	Major adverse: a change that would result in a substantial and noticeable adverse effect on visitor use of paved and unpaved trails	
	Major beneficial: a change that would result in a substantial and noticeable beneficial effect on visitor use of paved and unpaved trails	
	Negligible adverse: a change that would not be detectable and would have no discernable effect on connections between adjacent communities and the park	
	Minor adverse: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an overall effect on connections between adjacent communities and the park	
	Minor beneficial: a change that would be slightly detectable and would not be expected to have an overall minor beneficial effect on connections between adjacent communities and the park	28, 29, 39, 45, 157, 24, 25, 83
	Moderate adverse: a change that would be clearly detectable and could have an appreciable adverse effect on connections between adjacent communities and the park	
	Moderate beneficial: a change that would be clearly detectable and could have an appreciable beneficial effect on connections between adjacent communities and the park	
	Major adverse: a change that would result in a substantial and noticeable adverse effect on visitor use of paved and unpaved trails	
	Major beneficial: a change that would result in a substantial and noticeable beneficial effect connections between adjacent communities and the park	
	Negligible adverse: a change that would not be detectable and would have no discernable effect on management of motorized transportation in the park	
	Minor adverse: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an overall effect on management of nonmotorized transportation in the park	
	Minor beneficial: a change that would be slightly detectable and would not be expected to have an overall minor beneficial effect on management of nonmotorized transportation in the park	6, 111, 13, 14, 26, 54, 110, 138, 16, 18, 28, 29, 34, 35, 39, 43, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 59, 61, 70, 73, 77, 81, 94, 112, 120, 122, 126, 135, 136, 154, 157, 160, 175, 57, 92, 164, 115
	Moderate adverse: a change that would be clearly detectable and could have an appreciable adverse effect on management of nonmotorized transportation in the park	
	Moderate beneficial: a change that would be clearly detectable and could have an appreciable beneficial effect on management of nonmotorized transportation in the park	
	Major adverse: a change that would result in a substantial and noticeable adverse effect on management of nonmotorized transportation in the park	
	Major beneficial: a change that would result in a substantial and noticeable beneficial effect on management of nonmotorized transportation in the park	
	Negligible adverse: a change that would not be detectable and would have no discernable effect on off-road bicycle use in the park	
	Minor adverse: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an overall effect on off-road bicycle use in the park	
	Minor beneficial: a change that would be slightly detectable and would not be expected to have an overall minor beneficial effect on off-road bicycle use in the park	121, 16, 28, 29, 34, 35, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 53, 59, 70, 73, 81, 94, 112, 120, 122, 126, 135, 154, 136, 160, 161, 175
	Moderate adverse: a change that would be clearly detectable and could have an appreciable adverse effect on off-road bicycle use in the park	



Appendix Table C-2. Impact Topics, Impact Thresholds, and Corresponding Issues Identified During Scoping.

Primary Impact Topic	Impact Thresholds	Corresponding GMP Issue Identified During Scoping (Appendix Table C-1)
	Moderate beneficial: a change that would be clearly detectable and could have an appreciable beneficial effect on off-road bicycle use in the park	
	Major adverse: a change that would result in a substantial and noticeable adverse effect on off-road bicycle use in the park	
	Major beneficial: a change that would result in a substantial and noticeable beneficial effect on off-road bicycle use in the park	
	Negligible adverse: a change that would not be detectable and would have no discernable effect on erosion and runoff associated with off-road bicycle use	
	Minor adverse: a change that would be slightly detectable and would have a measurable effect on erosion and runoff associated with off-road bicycle use in a few localized areas	
	Moderate adverse: a change that would be clearly detectable and could produce appreciable adverse effects of erosion and runoff associated with off-road bicycle in numerous localized areas	5, 52, 97, 8, 9, 10, 67, 34, 175
	Major adverse: a change that would result in a substantial and noticeable increase in erosion and runoff associated with off-road bicycle use over widespread portion of in the park	
	Minor beneficial: a change that would be slightly detectable and would not be expected to have an overall minor beneficial effect on off-road bicycle use in the park	
	Moderate beneficial: a change that would be clearly detectable and could have an appreciable beneficial effect on off-road bicycle use in the park	
Visitor and Community Values - Recreational Opportunity	Negligible adverse: a change would not be detectable to the visitor and would have no discernable effect on the ability to provide shared experiences such as walking, picnicking, bicycling, horseback riding, and participating in other activities that have come to be associated with the park?	
	Minor adverse: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an overall effect on the ability to provide shared experiences such as walking, picnicking, bicycling, horseback riding, and participating in other activities that have come to be associated with the park?	
	Minor beneficial: a change that would be slightly detectable and would be expected to have an overall noticeable benefit on the ability to provide shared experiences such as walking, picnicking, bicycling, horseback riding, and participating in other activities that have come to be associated with the park	12, 56, 78, 140, 5, 52, 156, 7, 8, 9, 10, 6, 14, 26, 27, 30, 66, 75, 82, 110, 153, 179, 15, 60, 100, 16, 18, 28, 29, 34, 35, 39, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 59, 61, 70, 77, 94, 112, 120, 122, 126, 157, 161, 175, 116, 117
	Moderate adverse: a that would be clearly detectable by the visitor and could have an appreciable adverse effect on the lasting value of the park as a gathering place for family and friends	
	Moderate beneficial: a change that would be clearly detectable by the visitor and could have an appreciable beneficial effect on the ability to provide shared experiences such as walking, picnicking, bicycling, horseback riding, and participating in other activities that have come to be associated with the park	
	Major adverse: a substantial and noticeable adverse effect on the ability to provide shared experiences such as walking, picnicking, bicycling, horseback riding, and participating in other activities that have come to be associated with the park	
	Major beneficial: a change that would have a substantial and noticeable positive effect on the ability to provide shared experiences such as walking, picnicking, bicycling, horseback riding, and participating in other activities that have come to be associated with the park	
	Negligible adverse: a change would not be detectable to the visitor and would have no discernable effect on the ability to provide individual and physically challenging recreation such as biking, boating, fishing, jogging, and hiking	
	Minor adverse: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an overall effect on the ability to provide individual and physically challenging recreation such as biking, boating, fishing, jogging, and hiking	
	Minor beneficial: a change that would be slightly detectable and would be expected to have an overall noticeable effect on the ability to provide individual and physically challenging recreation such as biking, boating, fishing, jogging, and hiking	12, 140, 149, 89, 10, 106, 116, 117, 118, 120, 122, 157, 16, 161, 175, 28, 29, 34, 47, 48, 50, 53, 54, 61, 59

Appendix Table C-2. Impact Topics, Impact Thresholds, and Corresponding Issues Identified During Scoping.

Primary Impact Topic	Impact Thresholds	Corresponding GMP Issue Identified During Scoping (Appendix Table C-1)
	Moderate adverse: a that would be clearly detectable by the visitor and could have an appreciable adverse effect on the ability to provide individual and physically challenging recreation such as biking, boating, fishing, jogging, and hiking	
	Moderate beneficial: a change that would be clearly detectable by the visitor and could have an appreciable beneficial effect on the ability to provide individual and physically challenging recreation such as biking, boating, fishing, jogging, and hiking	
	Major adverse: a substantial and noticeable adverse effect on the lasting value of the park as a gathering place for family and friends	
	Major beneficial: a change that would have a substantial and noticeable positive effect on effect on the ability to provide individual and physically challenging recreation such as biking, boating, fishing, jogging, and hiking	
Visitor and Community Values - Visitor experience	Negligible adverse: a change would not be detectable to the visitor and would have no discernable effect on the ability of the park to provide a restorative value to people as a place of natural beauty and escape from the nearby urban setting	
	Minor adverse: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an overall effect on the ability of the park to provide a restorative value to people as a place of natural beauty and escape from the nearby urban setting	
	Minor beneficial: a change that would be slightly detectable and would be expected to have an overall noticeable benefit by improving the restorative value of the park to people as a place of natural beauty and escape from the nearby urban setting	5, 52, 156, 148, 7, 8, 9, 6, 27, 66
	Moderate adverse: a that would be clearly detectable by the visitor and could have an appreciable adverse effect on the ability of the park to provide a restorative value to people as a place of natural beauty and escape from the nearby urban setting	
	Moderate beneficial: a change that would be clearly detectable by the visitor and could have an appreciable beneficial effect on the ability of the park to provide restorative value to people as a place of natural beauty and escape from the nearby urban setting	
	Major adverse: a substantial and noticeable adverse effect on traditional park character and visitor experience	
	Major beneficial: a change that would have a substantial and noticeable positive effect on the ability of the park to provide restorative value to people as a place of natural beauty and escape from the nearby urban setting	
	Negligible adverse: a change would not be detectable to the visitor and would have no discernable effect on the park's scenery, opportunities to learn about the natural world, natural quiet, and the ability to hear natural sounds	
	Minor adverse: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an overall effect on the park's scenery, opportunities to learn about the natural world, natural quiet, and the ability to hear natural sounds	
	Minor beneficial: a change that would be slightly detectable and would be expected to have an overall noticeable benefit on the park's scenery, opportunities to learn about the natural world, natural quiet, and the ability to hear natural sounds	5, 52, 156, 148, 7, 8, 9, 6, 27, 66
	Moderate adverse: a that would be clearly detectable by the visitor and could have an appreciable adverse effect on the park's scenery, opportunities to learn about the natural world, natural quiet, and the ability to hear natural sounds	
	Moderate beneficial: a change that would be clearly detectable by the visitor and could have an appreciable beneficial effect on the on the park's scenery, opportunities to learn about the natural world, natural quiet, and the ability to hear natural sounds	
	Major adverse: a substantial and noticeable adverse effect on park's scenery, opportunities to learn about the natural world, natural quiet, and the ability to hear natural sounds	
	Major beneficial: a change that would have a substantial and noticeable positive effect on the on the scenery, opportunities to learn about the natural world, natural quiet, and the ability to hear natural sounds	

Appendix Table C-2. Impact Topics, Impact Thresholds, and Corresponding Issues Identified During Scoping.

Primary Impact Topic	Impact Thresholds	Corresponding GMP Issue Identified During Scoping (Appendix Table C-1)
	Negligible adverse: a change would not be detectable to the visitor and would have no discernable effect on the lasting value of the park as a gathering place for family and friends	
	Minor adverse: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an overall effect on the lasting value of the park as a gathering place for family and friends	
	Minor beneficial: a change that would be slightly detectable and would be expected to have an overall noticeable benefit on the lasting value of the park as a gathering place for family and friends	5, 52, 156, 7,8, 9, 10, 6, 82
	Moderate adverse: a that would be clearly detectable by the visitor and could have an appreciable adverse effect on the lasting value of the park as a gathering place for family and friends	
	Moderate beneficial: a change that would be clearly detectable by the visitor and could have an appreciable beneficial effect on the lasting value of the park as a gathering place for family and friends	
	Major adverse: a substantial and noticeable adverse effect on the lasting value of the park as a gathering place for family and friends	
	Major beneficial: a change that would have a substantial and noticeable positive effect on the lasting value of the park as a gathering place for family and friends	
Visitor and Community Values - Numbers and types of visitor facilities	Negligible adverse: a change would not be detectable to the visitor and would have no discernable effect on the ability of management to repair and maintain facilities	
	Minor adverse: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an overall effect on the ability of management to repair and maintain facilities	
	Minor beneficial: a change that would be slightly detectable and would be expected to have an overall noticeable benefit on the ability of management to repair and maintain facilities	3, 42, 106, 107, 113, 114, 127, 146, 177, 110, 53, 81
	Moderate adverse: a that would be clearly detectable by the visitor and could have an appreciable adverse effect on the ability of management to repair and maintain facilities	
	Moderate beneficial: a change that would be clearly detectable by the visitor and could have an appreciable beneficial effect on the ability of management to repair and maintain facilities?	
	Major adverse: a substantial and noticeable adverse effect on the ability of management to repair and maintain facilities	
	Major beneficial: a change that would have a substantial and noticeable positive effect on the ability of management to repair and maintain facilities	
	Negligible adverse: a change would not be detectable to the visitor and would have no discernable effect on historic resources present within the park and their appreciation by the public	
	Minor adverse: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an overall effect on the historic resources present within the park and their appreciation by the public	
	Minor beneficial: a change that would be slightly detectable and would be expected to have an overall noticeable benefit on the historic resources present within the park and their appreciation by the public	170
	Moderate adverse: a that would be clearly detectable by the visitor and could have an appreciable adverse effect on the historic resources present within the park and their appreciation by the public	
	Moderate beneficial: a change that would be clearly detectable by the visitor and could have an appreciable beneficial effect on the historic resources present within the park and their appreciation by the public	
	Major adverse: a substantial and noticeable adverse effect on the historic resources present within the park and their appreciation by the public	

Appendix Table C-2. Impact Topics, Impact Thresholds, and Corresponding Issues Identified During Scoping.

Primary Impact Topic	Impact Thresholds	Corresponding GMP Issue Identified During Scoping (Appendix Table C-1)
	Major beneficial: a change that would have a substantial and noticeable positive effect on the historic resources present within the park and their appreciation by the public	
Visitor and Community Values - Traditional Character	Negligible adverse: a change would not be detectable to the visitor and would have no discernable effect on the park's natural qualities, including ecological resources	
	Minor adverse: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an overall effect on the park's natural qualities, including ecological resources	
	Minor beneficial: a change that would be slightly detectable and would be expected to have an overall noticeable benefit on the park's natural qualities, including ecological resources	5, 52, 156, 148, 7, 8, 9, 6, 27, 66
	Moderate adverse: a that would be clearly detectable by the visitor and could have an appreciable adverse effect on the park's natural qualities, including ecological resources	
	Moderate beneficial: a change that would be clearly detectable by the visitor and could have an appreciable beneficial effect on the park's natural qualities, including ecological resources	
	Major adverse: a substantial and noticeable adverse effect the park's natural qualities, including ecological resources	
	Major beneficial: a change that would have a substantial and noticeable positive effect on the on the park's natural qualities, including ecological resources	
	Negligible adverse: a change would not be detectable to the visitor and would have no discernable effect on the park's traditional, familiar character of the park's recreational features	
	Minor adverse: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an overall effect on the park's traditional, familiar character of the park's recreational features	
	Minor beneficial: a change that would be slightly detectable and would be expected to have an overall noticeable benefit on the park's traditional, familiar character of the park's recreational features	80, 106, 5, 52, 156, 8, 67, 6, 13, 14, 27, 66, 75, 108, 153, 16, 18, 29, 35, 43, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 59, 77, 94, 122, 175, 116, 117, 139, 142, 145, 162
	Moderate adverse: a that would be clearly detectable by the visitor and could have an appreciable adverse effect on the park's traditional, familiar character of the park's recreational features	
	Moderate beneficial: a change that would be clearly detectable by the visitor and could have an appreciable beneficial effect on the on the park's traditional, familiar character of the park's recreational features	
	Major adverse: a substantial and noticeable adverse effect on the park's traditional, familiar character of the park's recreational features	
	Major beneficial: a change that would have a substantial and noticeable positive effect on the on traditional, familiar character of the park's recreational features	
	Negligible adverse: a change that would not be detectable and would have no discernable effect on community character	
	Minor adverse: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an overall effect on community character	
	Minor beneficial: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an noticeable beneficial effect on community character	5, 52, 156, 8, 19, 38, 55, 68, 74, 76, 79, 92, 147, 24, 25, 83, 84
	Moderate adverse: a change that would be clearly detectable and could have an appreciable effect on community character	
	Moderate beneficial: a change that would be clearly detectable and could have an appreciable beneficial effect on community character	
	Major adverse: a substantial and noticeable change that could permanently alter community character	
	Major beneficial: a substantial and noticeable change that could permanently alter community character in beneficial manner	

Appendix Table C-2. Impact Topics, Impact Thresholds, and Corresponding Issues Identified During Scoping.

Primary Impact Topic	Impact Thresholds	Corresponding GMP Issue Identified During Scoping (Appendix Table C-1)
	Negligible adverse: a change that would not be detectable and would have no discernable effect on the park as a major asset to the quality of life in the Atlanta metropolitan area	
	Minor adverse: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an overall effect on the park as a major asset to the quality of life in the Atlanta metropolitan area	
	Minor beneficial: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an noticeable beneficial effect on the park as a major asset to the quality of life in the Atlanta metropolitan area	5, 11, 52, 91, 156, 7, 8, 9, 10, 67, 102, 133, 6, 27, 30, 66, 110, 153, 179, 60, 100, 51, 59, 20, 68, 79, 24, 25, 83, 84
	Moderate adverse: a change that would be clearly detectable and could have an appreciable effect on the park as a major asset to the quality of life in the Atlanta metropolitan area	
	Moderate beneficial: a change that would be clearly detectable and could have an appreciable beneficial effect on the park as a major asset to the quality of life in the Atlanta metropolitan area	
	Major adverse: a substantial and noticeable change that could permanently alter the park as a major asset to the quality of life in the Atlanta metropolitan area	
	Major beneficial: a substantial and noticeable change that could permanently alter the park as a major asset to the quality of life in the Atlanta metropolitan area	
	Negligible adverse: a change that would not be detectable and would have no discernable effect on scenic and recreational amenities provided by the park	
	Minor adverse: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an overall effect on scenic and recreational amenities provided by the park	
	Minor beneficial: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an noticeable beneficial effect on scenic and recreational amenities provided by the park	12, 56, 78, 3, 5, 11, 52, 148, 156, 7, 8, 9, 10, 111, 6, 13, 14, 27, 30, 66, 130, 153, 179, 60, 100, 16, 18, 29, 34, 35, 39, 47, 48, 50, 53, 59, 61, 94, 154, 157, 160, 161, 175, 116, 117, 145, 139, 98, 131
	Moderate adverse: a change that would be clearly detectable and could have an appreciable effect on scenic and recreational amenities provided by the park	
	Moderate beneficial: a change that would be clearly detectable and could have an appreciable beneficial effect on scenic and recreational amenities provided by the park	
	Major adverse: a substantial and noticeable change that could permanently alter scenic and recreational amenities provided by the park	
	Major beneficial: a substantial and noticeable change that could permanently alter scenic and recreational amenities provided by the park	
	Negligible adverse: a change that would not be detectable and would have no discernable effect on proximity and access to the park	
	Minor adverse: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an overall effect on proximity and access to the park	
	Minor beneficial: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an noticeable beneficial effect on proximity and access to the park	12, 56, 140, 13, 26, 30, 75, 130, 176, 15, 60, 100, 18, 45, 47, 61, 157, 24, 25, 83, 22, 137, 167
	Moderate adverse: a change that would be clearly detectable and could have an appreciable effect on proximity and access to the park	
	Moderate beneficial: a change that would be clearly detectable and could have an appreciable beneficial effect on proximity and access to the park	
	Major adverse: a substantial and noticeable change that could permanently alter proximity and access to the park	
	Major beneficial: a substantial and noticeable change that could permanently alter proximity and access to the park	
	Negligible adverse: a change that would not be detectable and would have no discernable effect on the experience provided for adjoining neighborhoods	
	Minor adverse: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an overall effect the experience provided for adjoining neighborhoods	

Appendix Table C-2. Impact Topics, Impact Thresholds, and Corresponding Issues Identified During Scoping.

Primary Impact Topic	Impact Thresholds	Corresponding GMP Issue Identified During Scoping (Appendix Table C-1)
	Minor beneficial: a change that would be slightly detectable but would not be expected to have an noticeable beneficial effect on the experience provided for adjoining neighborhoods	5, 52, 156, 7, 8, 9, 67, 71, 102, 133, 6, 27, 64, 66, 82, 15, 60, 100, 38, 55, 68, 74, 76, 79, 164, 24, 25, 83, 84, 99, 86, 167
	Moderate adverse: a change that would be clearly detectable and could have an appreciable effect on the experience provided for adjoining neighborhoods	
	Moderate beneficial: a change that would be clearly detectable and could have an appreciable beneficial effect the experience provided for adjoining neighborhoods	
	Major adverse: a substantial and noticeable change that could permanently alter the experience provided for adjoining neighborhoods	
	Major beneficial: a substantial and noticeable change that could permanently alter the experience provided for adjoining neighborhoods	

Table C.3: Highlights of Class C Cost Comparison by Alternative

<u>Alternative</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Gross Construction Costs</u>
Focus on Solitude	Trails/Access	4,838,000*
	Restrooms/Picnic	303,000
	Education/Visitors	2,072,000
	Signage	224,000
	Cultural Resources/Restoration	1,173,000
	Design and Construction	1,550,000
	*Includes \$2.8 million for integrated trail system	
Total: 10,160,000		
<hr/>		
Centralized Access	Trails/Access	7,950,000*
	Restrooms/Picnic	482,000
	Education/Visitors	6,979,000†
	Signage	224,000
	Cultural Resources/Restoration	1,173,000
	Design and Construction	3,025,000
	*Includes \$2.8 million for integrated trail system	
†Includes Education/Visitor Centers at 3 Hubs		
Total: 19,833,000		
<hr/>		
Expanded Use	Trails/Access	10,103,000*
	Restrooms/Picnic	512,000
	Education/Visitors	13,701,000
	Signage	224,000
	Cultural Resources/Restoration	1,173,000
	Design and Construction	4,628,000
	*Includes \$2.8 million for integrated trail system	
Total: 30,341,000		
<hr/>		
No Action	N/A	N/A



**Table C-4. Life-Cycle Analysis Summary**

Project/Location: Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area

**Subject: Functional Component**

Description:

Project Life Cycle = **25 Years**

Discount Rate = **7.00%**

Present Time = **Apr-04**

			<b>Alternative 1</b>		<b>Alternative 2</b>		<b>Alternative 3</b>		<b>Alternative 4</b>	
			No Action		Focus on Solitude		Centralized Access		Expanded Use	
<b>INITIAL COSTS</b>	<b>Quantity UM</b>	<b>Unit Price</b>	<b>Est.</b>	<b>PW</b>	<b>Est.</b>	<b>PW</b>	<b>Est.</b>	<b>PW</b>	<b>Est.</b>	<b>PW</b>
Construction Costs										
A. Trails/Access		\$0.00		0	4,838,000	4,838,000	7,950,000	7,950,000	10,103,000	10,103,000
B. Restrooms/Picnic Areas		\$0.00		0	302,000	302,000	482,000	482,000	512,000	512,000
C. Education Centers		\$0.00		0	2,072,000	2,072,000	6,978,000	6,978,000	13,701,000	13,701,000
D. Signage		\$0.00		0	224,000	224,000	224,000	224,000	224,000	224,000
E.		\$0.00		0		0		0		0
F.		\$0.00		0		0		0		0
G.				0		0		0		0
<b>Total Initial Cost</b>				<b>0</b>		<b>7,436,000</b>		<b>15,634,000</b>		<b>24,540,000</b>
<b>Initial Cost PW Savings (Compared to Alt. 1)</b>						<b>(7,436,000)</b>		<b>(15,634,000)</b>		<b>(24,540,000)</b>
<b>REPLACEMENT COST/ SALVAGE VALUE</b>										
<b>Description</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>PW Factor</b>								
A. Trails/Access	20	0.2584		0	4,838,000	1,250,231	7,950,000	2,054,431	10,103,000	2,610,807
B. Restrooms/Picnic Areas	20	0.2584		0	302,000	78,042	482,000	124,557	512,000	132,310
C. Education Centers	50	0.0339		0	2,072,000	70,339	6,978,000	236,887	13,701,000	465,118
D. Signage	10	0.5083		0	224,000	113,870	224,000	113,870	224,000	113,870
E.	0	1.0000		0		0		0		0
<b>Total Replacement/Salvage Costs</b>				<b>0</b>		<b>1,512,482</b>		<b>2,529,745</b>		<b>3,322,105</b>
<b>ANNUAL COSTS</b>										
<b>Description</b>	<b>Escl. %</b>	<b>PWA</b>								
A. Maintenance	0.000%	11.654		0		0		0		0
B. Operations	0.000%	11.654	700,000	8,157,508	930,000	10,837,832	930,000	10,837,832	930,000	10,837,832
C. Staffing	0.000%	11.654	4,056,000	47,266,933	7,375,000	85,945,176	5,535,000	64,502,583	7,216,000	84,092,256
D.	0.000%	11.654		0		0		0		0
E.	0.000%	11.654		0		0		0		0
F.	0.000%	11.654		0		0		0		0
<b>Total Annual Costs (Present Worth)</b>				<b>55,424,442</b>		<b>96,783,008</b>		<b>75,340,415</b>		<b>94,930,089</b>
<b>Total Life Cycle Costs (Present Worth)</b>				<b>55,424,442</b>		<b>105,731,490</b>		<b>93,504,160</b>		<b>122,792,194</b>
<b>Life Cycle Savings (Compared to Alt. 1)</b>						<b>(50,307,049)</b>		<b>(38,079,719)</b>		<b>(67,367,752)</b>
<b>Discounted Payback (Compared to Alt. 1)</b>	<b>PP Factor</b>				<b>-2.02 Years</b>		<b>-8.12 Years</b>		<b>-6.68 Years</b>	
<b>Total Life Cycle Costs (Annualized)</b>	<b>0.0858</b>		<b>4,756,000 Per Year</b>		<b>9,072,874 Per Year</b>		<b>8,023,640 Per Year</b>		<b>10,536,862 Per Year</b>	



**Table C- 5 - CRNRA GMP/EIS Choosing by Advantage - Attributes Assigned to Each Factor by Alternative<sup>1</sup>**

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 – No Action
<b>Factor 1: Protect and improve the conditions of park natural resources including – habitat diversity and quality, species health and diversity and water quality.</b>			
Establishes Pristine River Zone	No Pristine River Zone	<i>No Pristine River Zone</i>	No Pristine River Zone
Lowest internal nonpoint sources, impervious and stormwater runoff (no new roads and infrastructure; possibly reduce)	Moderate internal nonpoint sources, impervious and stormwater runoff (no new roads and infrastructure; possibly reduce)	<u>Highest internal nonpoint sources, impervious and stormwater runoff (no new roads and infrastructure; possibly reduce)</u>	High internal nonpoint sources, impervious and stormwater runoff (no new roads and infrastructure; possibly reduce)
Greatest amount of restoration. Highest protection of wetlands and floodplains. Building/facility removal (e.g. Abbots Bridge)	Moderate amount of restoration. Highest protection of wetlands and floodplains. Building/facility removal (e.g. Abbots Bridge)	<u>Low amount of restoration. Highest protection of wetlands and floodplains. Building/facility removal (e.g. Abbots Bridge)</u>	Lowest amount of restoration. Highest protection of wetlands and floodplains. Building/facility removal (e.g. Abbots Bridge)
Highest species protection; increased diversity; T&E	Moderate species protection; increased diversity; T&E	<u>Lowest species protection; increased diversity; T&amp;E</u>	Low species protection; increased diversity; T&E
High reintroduction of native species (and reduce related impacts – e.g. dogs)	Moderate reintroduction of native species (and reduce related impacts – e.g. dogs)	<u>Lowest reintroduction of native species (and reduce related impacts – e.g. dogs)</u>	Low reintroduction of native species (and reduce related impacts – e.g. dogs)
Low potential for erosion and sedimentation (less development)	Moderate potential for erosion and sedimentation (less development)	<u>High potential for erosion and sedimentation (less development)</u>	Highest potential for erosion and sedimentation (less development)

<sup>1</sup>Note: The lowest assessment for each factor is highlighted in the assessment row by a heavy underline. In instances where more than one alternative scores lowest, only one is highlighted.

**Table C- 5 - CRNRA GMP/EIS Choosing by Advantage - Attributes Assigned to Each Factor by Alternative' (Continued)**

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 – No Action
Lowest noise and light impacts	Moderate noise and light impacts	<u>Moderate noise and light impacts</u>	Low noise and light impacts
Lowest access and facility infrastructure	Moderate access and facility infrastructure	<u>Highest access and facility infrastructure</u>	High access and facility infrastructure
Highest protection of green viewshed	High protection of green viewshed	<u>Lowest protection of green viewshed</u>	Moderate protection of green viewshed
Highest opportunity for scientific research	High opportunity for scientific research	<u>Lowest opportunity for scientific research</u>	Moderate opportunity for scientific research
Highest control/elimination of exotics	High control/elimination of exotics	<u>Low control/elimination of exotics</u>	Lowest control/elimination of exotics
<b>Factor 2: Protect and/or improve cultural resources</b>			
Lowest infrastructure and visitor use and related cultural resource impact – lowest exposure to site	Moderate infrastructure and visitor use and related cultural resource impact – moderate exposure to site	High infrastructure and visitor use and related cultural resource impact – high exposure to site	<u>Highest infrastructure and visitor use and related cultural resource impact – highest exposure to site</u>
High number of cultural resource management zones	High number of cultural resource management zones	Moderate number of cultural resource management zones	<u>No Zones</u>
Highest cultural resource research potential	Moderate cultural resource research potential	Lowest cultural resource research potential	<u>Low cultural resource research potential</u>

'Note: The lowest assessment for each factor is highlighted in the assessment row by a heavy underline. In instances where more than one alternative scores lowest, only one is highlighted.

**Table C- 5 - CRNRA GMP/EIS Choosing by Advantage - Attributes Assigned to Each Factor by Alternative' (Continued)**

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 – No Action
Least impacts to cultural resources from exotic plants	Moderate level of impact to cultural resources from exotic plants	High level of impact to cultural resources from exotic plants	<u>Highest level of impact to cultural resources from exotic plants</u>
Lowest erosion potential and related impacts to cultural resources	Moderate erosion potential and related impacts to cultural resources	High erosion potential and related impacts to cultural resources	<u>Highest erosion potential and related impacts to cultural resources</u>
<b>Factor 3: Provide a diversity of visitor experience and opportunities</b>			
Lowest diversity of visitor experience (fewer facilities)	<u>Moderate diversity of visitor experience (fewer facilities)</u>	Highest diversity of visitor experience (fewer facilities)	High diversity of visitor experience (fewer facilities)
Adds Pristine River zone	<u>No Pristine River zone</u>	No Pristine River zone	No Pristine River zone
<b>Factor 4: Provide opportunities for resource- oriented activities (non- facilitated based) such as solitude, isolation, and natural resource based experiences</b>			
Greatest opportunity for solitude	Moderate opportunity for solitude	<u>Least opportunity for solitude</u>	Low opportunity for solitude
Greatest opportunity to experience natural beauty	Moderate opportunity to experience natural beauty	<u>Least opportunity to experience natural beauty</u>	Low opportunity to experience natural beauty
Lowest level of user conflict	Moderate level of user conflict	<u>Highest level of user conflict</u>	High level of user conflict

'Note: The lowest assessment for each factor is highlighted in the assessment row by a heavy underline. In instances where more than one alternative scores lowest, only one is highlighted.

**Table C- 5 - CRNRA GMP/EIS Choosing by Advantage - Attributes Assigned to Each Factor by Alternative' (Continued)**

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 – No Action
Lowest intrusion from NPS operation (motors, chainsaws, developed maintenance)	Moderate intrusion from NPS operation (motors, chainsaws, developed maintenance)	<u>Highest intrusion from NPS operation (motors, chainsaws, developed maintenance)</u>	High intrusion from NPS operation (motors, chainsaws, developed maintenance)
Low NPS- guided activities	Highest NPS- guided activities	<u>High NPS- guided activities</u>	Least NPS- guided activities
<b>Factor 5: Provide opportunities for facility- oriented recreation experiences, such as biking, horseback riding, and picnicking</b>			
<u>Limited/fewer facilities, lowest number of facilities</u>	Moderate number of facilities	Highest number of facilities	Moderate number of facilities
<u>Lowest amount of paved trails or surfaces</u>	Moderate amount of paved trails or surfaces	Highest amount of paved trails or surfaces	Moderate amount of paved trails or surfaces
<u>Lowest opportunity for biking, skating, etc.</u>	Moderate opportunity for biking, skating, etc.	Highest opportunity for biking, skating, etc.	Low opportunity for biking, skating, etc.

'Note: The lowest assessment for each factor is highlighted in the assessment row by a heavy underline. In instances where more than one alternative scores lowest, only one is highlighted.

**Table C- 5 - CRNRA GMP/EIS Choosing by Advantage - Attributes Assigned to Each Factor by Alternative' (Continued)**

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 – No Action
<b>Factor 6: Provide opportunities for immediate park neighborhoods and the adjacent communities</b>			
<u>Lowest opportunity for connectivity/linkages with adjacent communities</u>	Moderate opportunity for connectivity/linkages with communities	Highest opportunity for connectivity/linkages with communities	High opportunity for connectivity/linkages with communities
<u>Low opportunity for on- site information/education for communities</u>	High opportunity for on- site information/education for communities	Highest opportunity for on- site information/education for communities	Lowest opportunity for on- site information/education for communities
<b>Factor 7: Provide opportunities to enhance park operations</b>			
Fewest new facilities – maintains simplicity; lowest coordination need	Moderate facility increase, moderate complexity	<u>Highest number of new facilities and highest complexity</u>	Moderate facility increase, moderate complexity
Resource Management more controlled – least complex issues, fewer compliance needs	Moderate RM complexity and compliance	<u>Highest RM complexity and compliance</u>	High RM complexity and compliance
Highest effort to change traditional use patterns	High effort to change traditional use patterns	<u>Minimal effort to change traditional use patterns</u>	Least effort to change traditional use patterns
Demands limited focus on partnerships	High focus on partnerships	<u>Moderate focus on partnerships</u>	Least focus on partnerships

'Note: The lowest assessment for each factor is highlighted in the assessment row by a heavy underline. In instances where more than one alternative scores lowest, only one is highlighted.

Table C- 5 - CRNRA GMP/EIS Choosing by Advantage - Attributes Assigned to Each Factor by Alternative' (Continued)

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 – No Action
<b>Factor 8: Improve visibility and awareness of educational opportunities concerning NPS and the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area</b>			
Greatest demand for outreach	Moderate demand for outreach	Minimal demand for outreach	<i><b>Least outreach</b></i>
Most neighborhood involvement to create linkages	Moderate neighborhood involvement to create linkages	Minimal neighborhood involvement to create linkages	<u>No neighborhood involvement to create linkages</u>
Least local government involvement to create linkages	Most local government involvement to create linkages	Moderate local government involvement to create linkages	<u>Minimal government involvement to create linkages</u>
Fewest facilities, contact stations, kiosks. Lowest physical visibility	Moderate number of facilities, etc. Moderate physical visibility	Highest number facilities, contact stations, etc. Highest physical visibility	<u>Moderate facilities and physical visibility</u>

'Note: The lowest assessment for each factor is highlighted in the assessment row by a heavy underline. In instances where more than one alternative scores lowest, only one is highlighted.

## **APPENDIX D**

### **PARK LEGISLATION**

PUBLIC LAW 106-154—DEC. 9, 1999

CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER NATIONAL  
RECREATION AREA IMPROVEMENTS



113 STAT. 1736

PUBLIC LAW 106-154—DEC. 9, 1999

Public Law 106-154  
108th Congress

An Act

Dec. 9, 1999  
(H. R. 2140)

To improve protection and management of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

18 USC 460(i)  
note.

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia is a nationally significant resource;

(2) the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area has been adversely affected by land use changes occurring inside and outside the recreation area;

(3) the population of the metropolitan Atlanta area continues to expand northward, leaving dwindling opportunities to protect the scenic, recreational, natural, and historical values of the 2,000-foot-wide corridor adjacent to each bank of the Chattahoochee River and its impoundments in the 48-mile segment known as the "area of national concern";

(4) the State of Georgia has enacted the Metropolitan River Protection Act to ensure protection of the corridor located within 2,000 feet of each bank of the Chattahoochee River, or the corridor located within the 100-year floodplain, whichever is larger;

(5) the corridor located within the 100-year floodplain includes the area of national concern;

(6) since establishment of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area, visitor use of the recreation area has shifted dramatically from waterborne to water-related and land-based activities;

(7) the State of Georgia and political subdivisions of the State along the Chattahoochee River have indicated willingness to join in a cooperative effort with the United States to link existing units of the recreation area through a series of linear corridors to be established within the area of national concern and elsewhere on the river; and

(8) if Congress appropriates funds in support of the cooperative effort described in paragraph (7), funding from the State, political subdivisions of the State, private foundations, corporate entities, private individuals, and other sources will be available to fund more than half the estimated cost of the cooperative effort.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to increase the level of protection of the open spaces within the area of national concern along the Chattahoochee

PUBLIC LAW 106-154—DEC. 9, 1999

113 STAT. 1737

River and to enhance visitor enjoyment of the open spaces by adding land-based linear corridors to link existing units of the recreation area;

(2) to ensure that the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area is managed to standardize acquisition, planning, design, construction, and operation of the linear corridors; and

(3) to authorize the appropriation of Federal funds to cover a portion of the costs of the Federal, State, local, and private cooperative effort to add additional areas to the recreation area so as to establish a series of linear corridors linking existing units of the recreation area and to protect other open spaces of the Chattahoochee River corridor.

**SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER NATIONAL RECREATION AREA ACT.**

(a) **BOUNDARIES.**—Section 101 of the Act entitled “An Act to authorize the establishment of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes”, approved August 15, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 460ii), is amended—

(1) in the third sentence, by inserting after “numbered CHAT-20,003, and dated September 1984,” the following: “and on the maps entitled ‘Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area Interim Boundary Map #1’, ‘Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area Interim Boundary Map #2’, and ‘Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area Interim Boundary Map #3’, and dated August 6, 1998,”;

(2) by striking the fourth sentence and inserting the following: “No sooner than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this sentence, the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter referred to as the ‘Secretary’) may modify the boundaries of the recreation area to include other land within the Chattahoochee River corridor by submitting a revised map or other boundary description to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate and the Committee on Resources of the United States House of Representatives. The revised map or other boundary description shall be prepared by the Secretary after consultation with affected landowners, the State of Georgia, and affected political subdivisions of the State. The revised boundaries shall take effect 180 days after the date of submission unless, within the 180-day period, Congress enacts a joint resolution disapproving the revised boundaries.”; and

(3) in the next-to-last sentence, by striking “may not exceed approximately 6,800 acres.” and inserting “may not exceed 10,000 acres.”.

(b) **ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY.**—Section 102 of the Act entitled “An Act to authorize the establishment of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes”, approved August 15, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 460ii-1), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “from willing sellers” after “purchase”; and

(2) by striking subsection (f).

(c) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—Section 103 of the Act entitled “An Act to authorize the establishment of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia, and for other

113 STAT. 1738

PUBLIC LAW 106-154—DEC. 9, 1999

purposes", approved August 15, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 460ii-2), is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:  
"(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the State of Georgia, political subdivisions of the State, and other entities to ensure standardized acquisition, planning, design, construction, and operation of the recreation area."

(d) FUNDING.—Section 105 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the establishment of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes", approved August 15, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 460ii-4), is amended—

(1) by striking "SEC. 105. (a)" and inserting the following:

"SEC. 105. FUNDING SOURCES AND GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.

"(a) FUNDING.—

"(1) LIMITATION ON USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—";

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "\$79,400,000" and inserting "\$115,000,000";

(B) by striking "this Act" and inserting "this title";

and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) DONATIONS.—The Secretary may accept a donation of funds or land or an interest in land to carry out this title.

"(3) RELATION TO OTHER FUNDING SOURCES.—Funds made available under paragraph (1) are in addition to funding and the donation of land and interests in land by the State of Georgia, local government authorities, private foundations, corporate entities, and individuals for purposes of this title."; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(B) by striking "(c) Within" and inserting the following:

"(c) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

"(1) INITIAL PLAN.—Within";

(C) in paragraph (1) (as designated by subparagraph (B)), by striking "transmit to" and all that follows through "Representatives" and inserting "transmit to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) REVISED PLAN.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Within 3 years after the date funds are made available, the Secretary shall submit to the committees specified in paragraph (1) a revised general management plan to provide for the protection, enhancement, enjoyment, development, and use of the recreation area.

"(B) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—In preparing the revised plan, the Secretary shall encourage the participation of the State of Georgia and affected political subdivisions of the State, private landowners, interested citizens, public officials, groups, agencies, educational institutions, and other entities."

(e) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Title I of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the establishment of the Chattahoochee River

PUBLIC LAW 106-154—DEC. 9, 1999

113 STAT. 1739

National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes", approved August 15, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 460ii et seq.), is amended—

(1) in sections 102(d) and 103(a), by striking "of this Act" and inserting "of this title";

16 USC 460ii-1,  
460ii-2.

(2) in section 104(b)—

16 USC 460ii-3.

(A) by striking "of this Act" and inserting "of this title";

(B) by striking "under this Act" and inserting "under this title";

(C) by striking "by this Act" and inserting "by this title"; and

(D) by striking "in this Act" and inserting "in this title";

(3) in section 104(d)(2), by striking "under this Act" and inserting "under this title";

(4) in section 105(c)(1)(A), as redesignated by subsection (d)(3), by striking "of this Act" and inserting "of this title";

16 USC 460ii-4.

(5) in section 106(a), by striking "in this Act" and inserting "in this title"; and

16 USC 460ii-5.

(6) in section 106(d), by striking "under this Act" and inserting "under this title".

Approved December 9, 1999.

---

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY—H. R. 2140 (S. 109):

HOUSE REPORTS: No. 106-369 (Comm. on Resources).

SENATE REPORTS: No. 106-62 accompanying S. 109 (Comm. on Energy and Natural Resources).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 145 (1999):

Oct. 18, considered and passed House.

Nov. 19, considered and passed Senate.

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS, Vol. 35 (1999):

Dec. 9, Presidential statement.

○

APPENDIX A

92 STAT. 474

PUBLIC LAW 95-344—AUG. 15, 1978

Public Law 95-344  
95th Congress

An Act

Aug. 15, 1978  
[H.R. 8336]

To authorize the establishment of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

Chattahoochee  
River National  
Recreation Area,  
Ga.

Establishment.  
16 USC 460ii.

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Congress finds the natural, scenic, recreation, historic, and other values of a forty-eight-mile segment of the Chattahoochee River and certain adjoining lands in the State of Georgia from Buford Dam downstream to Peachtree Creek are of special national significance, and that such values should be preserved and protected from developments and uses which would substantially impair or destroy them. In order to assure such preservation and protection for public benefit and enjoyment, there is hereby established the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area (hereinafter referred to as the "recreation area"). The recreation area shall consist of the river and its bed together with the lands, waters, and interests therein within the boundary generally depicted on the map entitled "Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area", numbered CHAT-20,000, and dated July 1976, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. Following reasonable notice in writing to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate of his intention to do so, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") may, by publication of a revised map or other boundary description in the Federal Register, (1) make minor revisions in the boundary of the recreation area, and (2) revise the boundary to facilitate access to the recreation area, or to delete lands which would be of little or no benefit to the recreation area due to the existence of valuable improvements completely constructed prior to the date of enactment of this Act. The total area, exclusive of the river and its bed, within the recreation area may not exceed six thousand three hundred acres.

Publication in  
Federal Register.

Land acquisition.  
16 USC 460u-1.

SEC. 102. (a) Within the recreation area the Secretary is authorized to acquire lands, waters, and interests therein by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange. Property owned by the State of Georgia or any political subdivision thereof may be acquired only by donation.

(b) When a tract of land lies partly within and partly without the boundaries of the recreation area, the Secretary may acquire the entire tract by any of the above methods in order to avoid the payment of severance costs. Land so acquired outside of the boundaries of the recreation area may be exchanged by the Secretary for non-Federal land within such boundaries, and any portion of the land not utilized for such exchanges may be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.).

PUBLIC LAW 95-344—AUG. 15, 1978

92 STAT. 475

(c) Except for property which the Secretary determines to be necessary for the purposes of administration, development, access, or public use, an owner of improved property which is used solely for noncommercial residential purposes on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may retain, as a condition of such acquisition, a right of use and occupancy of the property for such residential purposes. The right retained may be for a definite term which shall not exceed twenty-five years or, in lieu thereof, for a term ending at the death of the owner or the death of the spouse, whichever occurs later. The owner shall elect the term to be retained. The Secretary shall pay the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition, less the fair market value of the term retained by the owner.

(d) Any right of use and occupancy retained pursuant to this section may, during its existence, be conveyed or transferred, but all rights of use and occupancy shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate to assure the use of the property in accordance with the purposes of this Act. Upon his determination that the property, or any portion thereof, has ceased to be so used in accordance with such terms and conditions, the Secretary may terminate the right of use and occupancy by tendering to the holder of such right an amount equal to the fair market value, as of the date of the tender, of that portion of the right which remains unexpired on the date of termination.

(e) As used in this section, the term "improved property" means a detached, year-round noncommercial residential dwelling, the construction of which was begun before January 1, 1975, together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, the said land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the land so designated.

"Improved property."

SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary shall administer, protect, and develop the recreation area in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), and in accordance with any other statutory authorities available to him for the conservation and management of historic and natural resources, including fish and wildlife, to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act. In developing and administering the recreation area, the Secretary shall take into consideration applicable Federal, State, and local recreation plans and resource use and development plans, including, but not limited to, the Atlanta Regional Commission Chattahoochee Corridor Study, dated July 1972.

16 USC 460ii-2.

16 USC 1.

(b) The Secretary is authorized and encouraged to enter into cooperative agreements with the State or its political subdivisions whereby he may assist in the planning for and interpretation of non-Federal publicly owned lands within or adjacent or related to the recreation area to assure that such lands are used in a manner consistent with the findings and purposes of this Act.

(c) In planning for the development and public use of the recreation area, the Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of the Army to assure that public use of adjacent or related water resource development or flood control projects and that of the recreation area are complementary.

92 STAT. 476

PUBLIC LAW 95-344—AUG. 15, 1978

Regulations. (d) In administering the recreation area, the Secretary may permit fishing in waters under his jurisdiction in accordance with applicable State and Federal laws and regulations. The Secretary, after consultation with the appropriate State agency responsible for fishing activities, may designate zones where, and establish periods when, fishing shall be permitted and issue such regulations as he may determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection. Except in emergencies, such regulations shall be put into effect only after consultation with the appropriate State agency.

16 USC 460ii-3. SEC. 104. (a) The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall not license the construction of any dam, water conduit, reservoir, powerhouse, transmission line, or other project works under the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 791a et seq.), on or directly affecting the recreation area, and no department or agency of the United States shall assist by loan, grant, license, or otherwise in the construction of any water resources project that would have a direct and adverse effect on the values for which such area is established, except where such project is determined by the State of Georgia to be necessary for water supply or water quality enhancement purposes and authorized by the United States Congress. Nothing contained in the foregoing sentence, however, shall preclude licensing of, or assistance to, developments upstream or downstream from the recreation area or on any stream tributary thereto which will not invade the recreation area or unreasonably diminish the scenic, recreational, and fish and wildlife values present therein on the date of approval of this Act. Nothing contained in this subsection shall preclude the upgrading, improvement, expansion or development of facilities or public works for water supply or water quality enhancement purposes if such action would not have a material adverse effect on the values for which the recreation area is established.

Report to congressional committees. (b) No department or agency of the United States shall recommend authorization of any water resources project that would have a direct and adverse effect on the values for which such area is established, as determined by the Secretary, nor shall such department or agency request appropriations to begin construction of any such project, whether heretofore or hereafter authorized, without at least sixty days in advance, (1) advising the Secretary in writing of its intention to do so and (2) reporting to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate the nature of the project involved and the manner in which such project would conflict with the purposes of this Act or would affect the recreation area and the values to be protected by it under this Act. It is not the intention of Congress by this Act to require the manipulation or reduction of lake water levels in Lake Sidney Lanier. Nothing in this Act shall be construed in any way to restrict, prohibit, or affect any recommendation of the Metropolitan Atlanta Water Resources Study as authorized by the Public Works Committee of the United States Senate on March 2, 1972.

Land acquisition. (c) The Secretary is directed to proceed as expeditiously as possible to acquire the lands and interests in lands necessary to achieve the purposes of this Act.

16 USC 460ii-4. SEC. 105. (a) From the appropriations authorized for fiscal year 1978 and succeeding fiscal years pursuant to the Land and Water

PUBLIC LAW 95-344—AUG. 15, 1978

92 STAT. 477

Conservation Fund Act (78 Stat. 897), as amended, not more than \$72,900,000 may be expended for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands authorized to be acquired pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

16 USC 4601-4.

(b) Effective on October 1, 1978, there are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$500,000 for the development of essential public facilities.

Appropriation authorization.

(c) Within three years from the effective date of this Act, the Secretary shall, after consulting with the Governor of the State of Georgia, develop and transmit to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate a general management plan for the use and development of the recreation area consistent with the findings and purposes of this Act, indicating:

Plan, report to congressional committees.

(1) lands and interests in lands adjacent or related to the recreation area which are deemed necessary or desirable for the purposes of resource protection, scenic integrity, or management and administration of the area in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the estimated cost of acquisition, and the recommended public acquisition agency;

(2) the number of visitors and types of public use within the recreation area that can be accommodated in accordance with the full protection of its resources; and

(3) the facilities deemed necessary to accommodate and provide access for such visitors and uses, including their location and estimated cost.

#### TITLE II

SEC. 201. Section 4 of the Act approved August 31, 1965 (79 Stat. 588), as amended, providing for the commemoration of certain historical events in the State of Kansas, is further amended by changing "\$2,000,000." to "\$2,750,000.": *Provided*, That such increase shall be effective on October 1, 1978.

Appropriation authorization.

#### TITLE III

##### FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 301. (a) The Congress hereby finds that—

16 USC 2301.

(1) the purpose of the National Park System is to preserve outstanding natural, scenic, historic, and recreation areas for the enjoyment, education, inspiration, and use of all people;

(2) units of the National Park System have recently been established near major metropolitan areas in order to preserve remaining open space and to provide recreational opportunities for urban residents (many of whom do not have access to personal motor vehicles); and

(3) circumstances which necessarily require people desiring to visit units of the National Park System to rely on personal motor vehicles may diminish the natural and recreational value of such units by causing traffic congestion and environmental damage, and by requiring the provision of roads, parking, and other facilities in ever-increasing numbers and density.



## **APPENDIX E**

### **ISSUE FILTERING TABLE**

## APPENDIX E: ISSUE FILTERING TABLE

Not all NEPA resource categories were carried forward into the GMP/EIS. For certain issues, it was determined that implementation of any of the alternatives would not result in adverse impacts on the natural or man-made environment. The following table summarizes how specific NEPA resource categories were either retained or eliminated from further consideration. The text which follows the table provides a detailed basis for the elimination of each resource category:

**Table E- 1: Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area GMP/EIS Resources and Values Filtering Process<sup>1</sup>**

Resource Category	Decision Point 1	Decision Point 2	Decision Point 3
Surface Water Quality	✓	✓	✓
Surface Water Quantity	✓	✓	✓
Groundwater Quality			
Groundwater Quantity			
Aquatic Biological Resources	✓	✓	✓
Terrestrial Biological Resources	✓	✓	✓
Floodplains	✓	✓	✓
Wetlands	✓	✓	✓
Endangered Species	✓	✓	✓
Climate			
Special Status Species that do not Occur in the Park			
Physiography/Topography			
Earth Resources/Soils	✓	✓	✓
Prime and Unique Farmlands	✓	✓	✓
Natural or Depletable Resources			
Ecologically Critical Areas	✓	✓	✓
Wild and Scenic Rivers			
Archeological Resources	✓	✓	✓
Historical Resources	✓	✓	✓
Eligibility for Placement on the National Register of Historic Places	✓	✓	✓
Cultural Landscapes	✓	✓	✓
Traditional Uses	✓	✓	✓
Ethnographic Resources	✓	✓	✓
Indian Trust Resources			
Sacred Sites			
Noise			
Air Quality	✓	✓	✓
Socially or Culturally Disadvantaged Populations			

**Table E- 1: Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area GMP/EIS Resources and Values Filtering Process' (Continued)**

Resource Category	Decision Point 1	Decision Point 2	Decision Point 3
Land Use Plans, Policies, Controls	✓	✓	✓
Socioeconomic Resources (population, economics)	✓	✓	✓
Transportation	✓	✓	✓
Recreation	✓	✓	✓
Urban Quality	✓	✓	✓
Viewshed Quality	✓	✓	✓
Aesthetic Resources	✓	✓	✓
Energy Resources			
Public Health and Safety			
Natural or Depletable Resource Requirements & Conservation Potential			

'Checked categories were carried forward into the GMP/EIS for further analysis; shaded areas were eliminated from further consideration because they did not apply

The following is the basis for elimination of the specific resource categories:

**Groundwater Quantity:** Implementation of a particular management alternative would not have any impact on groundwater quantity, either positive or negative. Groundwater quantity is affected by various physical, geological and hydrologic factors that are outside of the control of park management.

**Groundwater Quality:** Groundwater quality would not be affected by any park management alternative. Groundwater quality is affected by factors such as transportation- or industrial- related spills of hazardous chemicals or industrial and commercial operations outside of park boundaries.

**Special Status Species that do not Occur in the Park:** Management alternatives would not affect any rare, threatened or endangered species in areas outside the park or in neighboring states. The park provides temporary habitat for some migratory species of protected animals from other states and outside of the park boundaries, but habitat for these species within the park would be preserved under any alternative that is selected. Therefore, this issue does not have to be analyzed further in the GMP/EIS.

**Physiography/Topography:** Alternative park management activities could result in some ground disturbing activities related to construction of parking lots, buildings, and roads. However, none of these activities would result in a significant modification of topography or physiography within the park boundaries.

**Climate:** None of the management alternatives would result in climate modification.

**Wild and Scenic Rivers:** The Chattahoochee River is not a federally- designated Wild and Scenic River, and the no management alternative would affect any designated Wild and Scenic River.

**Indian Trust Resources:** Designated Indian Trust Resources do not exist within the park, and therefore would not be impacted by any management alternative.

**Sacred Sites:** Designated native American sacred sites do not exist within the park, and would not be impacted by any management alternative.

**Noise:** The largest noise generator in the vicinity of the CRNRA is traffic. The alternatives considered in this GMP/EIS would not significantly change the overall traffic patterns or volumes that are projected to occur in the area around the park. Traffic in the area will continue to increase as described in the transportation section of the GMP/EIS, regardless of whether the CRNRA any of the management plan alternatives are instituted.

**Socially or Culturally Disadvantaged Populations:** Executive Order (EO) 12898 regarding "Federal Actions to address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low- Income Populations." requires, as of February 11, 1994, that each federal agency make achieving environmental justice part of their mission by identifying and addressing disproportionate high and

adverse human health effects of its programs, policies or activities on minority or low- income populations. The order applies to all federal actions that require NEPA documentation, and has three general objectives: 1) focus the attention of federal agencies on the human health and general environmental conditions in minority and low- income communities with the goal of achieving environmental justice; 2) foster nondiscrimination in federal programs that could substantially affect human health or the environment; and 3) give minority and low- income communities greater opportunities for public participation on matters relating to human health and safety.

For the purpose of fulfilling EO 12898 in the context of the National Environmental Policy Act, the alternatives addressed in the CRNRA GMP/EIS were assessed during the planning process. It was determined that none of the alternatives would result in discernable adverse effects upon any minority or low- income population or community. The following is a summary of the rationale for this conclusion:

1. Implementation of the GMP would not result in any adverse effects on human health. Therefore, none of the alternatives would have direct or indirect effects on any minority or low- income population or community.
2. Implementation of the plan would not have adverse impacts on the natural or man- made environment, as required by park policy. Therefore, plan implementation would not adversely effect any minority or low- income population or community.
3. Implementation of the plan would not result in any identified effects that would be specific to any minority or low- income population or community. Any development of new park facilities that might occur under any of the alternatives would be spread equally from north to south along the 48- mile CRNRA.
4. Impacts on the socioeconomic environment due implementation of any of the alternatives are minor or positive and occur primarily within the local and regional geographic area or near the park. These impacts would be spread at hubs located along the entire 48- mile park, and would also be spread over a long period of time. Impacts on the socioeconomic environment are also not expected to significantly alter the character of any nearby community in a negative way. Connections or increased access to the park at any location along the 48- mile park will have a beneficial effect on the social and economic resources in these areas.

**Energy Resources:** Implementation of the alternatives would involve varying use of energy resources, but these impacts would be minor in nature, and would not have a significant effect on regional energy resources.

**Public Health and Safety:** The National Park Service is charged with providing a safe and healthy environment within the park boundaries. This would be required under any management alternative and does not require additional analysis in the GMP/EIS.

**Natural or Depletable Resource Requirements & Conservation Potential:** None of the management alternatives would result in a significant depletion of natural resources, nor would they affect the potential to effect conservation of natural resources within the park.

## **APPENDIX F**

### **AGENCY COORDINATION**

APPENDIX F: AGENCY COORDINATION

Georgia Department of Natural Resources  
Wildlife Resources Division

LONICE C. BARRETT, COMMISSIONER  
DAVID WALLER, DIVISION DIRECTOR

Georgia Natural Heritage Program  
2117 U.S. Hwy. 278 S.E., Social Circle, Georgia 30025-4714  
(770) 918-6411, (706) 557-3032

February 1, 2001

Sean R. Wallace  
Senior Environmental Scientist  
Parsons Engineering Science, Inc.  
5390 Triangle Parkway, Suite 100  
Norcross, GA 30092

**Subject: Known or Potential Occurrences of Special Concern Plant and Animal Species on or near Proposed National Park Service Trails Construction Project at the Chattahoochee National Recreation Area in Cobb, DeKalb, Forsyth, Fulton, and Gwinnett Counties, Georgia**


Dear Mr. Wallace:

This is in response to your request of December 13, 2000. Enclosed is a list of special concern species found within one half mile of the proposed boundary of the Chattahoochee National Recreation Area and eight maps showing these occurrences. Also provided are lists that should aid in assessing the potential for rare species occurrences within the area of concern. Although lists of plant and animal species potentially occurring in Forsyth County have not yet been generated, provided are the lists of plant and animal species potentially occurring in Cobb, DeKalb, Fulton, and Gwinnett counties.

Please keep in mind the limitations of our database. The data collected by the Georgia Natural Heritage Program comes from a variety of sources, including museum and herbarium records, literature, and reports from individuals and organizations, as well as field surveys by our staff biologists. In most cases the information is not the result of a recent on-site survey by our staff. Many areas of Georgia have never been surveyed thoroughly. Therefore, the Georgia Natural Heritage Program can only occasionally provide definitive information on the presence or absence of rare species on a given site. Our files are updated constantly as new information is received. Thus, information provided by our program represents the existing data in our files at the time of the request and should not be considered a final statement on the species or area under consideration.

If you know the location of populations of special concern species that are not in our database, please fill out the appropriate data collection form and send it to our office. Forms can be obtained through our web site (<http://www.dnr.state.ga.us/dnr/wild/natural.html>) or by contacting our office. If I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,



Greg Krakow  
Data Manager

enclosures

UR 7998

Edition date: November 26, 2000

## GEORGIA NATURAL HERITAGE PROGRAM

### EXPLANATION OF CODES

### FOR RARITY RANK AND LEGAL STATUS

The "State Rank" and "Global Rank" codes indicate relative rarity of species statewide and range-wide, respectively. An explanation of these codes follows. For further information please see [www.natureserve.org/ranking](http://www.natureserve.org/ranking).

#### STATE [GLOBAL] RANK

S1[G1]	Critically imperiled in state [globally] because of extreme rarity (5 or fewer occurrences).
S2[G2]	Imperiled in state [globally] because of rarity (6 to 20 occurrences).
S3[G3]	Rare or uncommon in state [rare and local throughout range or in a special habitat or narrowly endemic] (on the order of 21 to 100 occurrences).
S4[G4]	Apparently secure in state [globally] (of no immediate conservation concern).
S5[G5]	Demonstrably secure in state [globally].
SA	Accidental in state, including migratory or wide-ranging species recorded only once or twice or at very great intervals.
SN	Regularly occurring, usually migratory and typically nonbreeding species.
SR	Reported from the state, but without persuasive documentation (no precise site records and no verification of taxonomy).
SU[GU]	Possibly in peril in state [range-wide] but status uncertain; need more information on threats or distribution.
SX[GX]	Apparently extirpated from state [extinct throughout range]. GXC is known only in cultivation/captivity.
SE	An exotic established in state. May be native elsewhere in North America. Sometimes difficult to determine if native (SE?).
SH[GH]	Of historical occurrence in the state [throughout its range], perhaps not verified in the past 20 years, but suspected to be still extant.
[T]	Taxonomic subdivision (trinomial, either a subspecies or variety), used in a global rank, for example "G2T2."
Q	Denotes a taxonomic question - either the taxon is not generally recognized as valid, or there is reasonable concern about its validity or identity globally or at the state level.
?	Denotes questionable rank; best guess given whenever possible (e.g. S3?).

## FEDERAL STATUS (US Fish and Wildlife Service, USFWS)

The following abbreviations are used to indicate the legal status of federally-protected plants and animals or those proposed for listing. For further information please see [www.natureserve.org/status](http://www.natureserve.org/status).

<b>LE</b>	Listed as endangered. The most critically imperiled species. A species that may become extinct or disappear from a significant part of its range if not immediately protected.
<b>LT</b>	Listed as threatened. The next most critical level of threatened species. A species that may become endangered if not protected.
<b>PE or PT</b>	Candidate species currently proposed for listing as endangered or threatened.
<b>C</b>	Candidate species presently under status review for federal listing for which adequate information exists on biological vulnerability and threats to list the taxa as endangered or threatened.
<b>PDL</b>	Proposed for delisting.
<b>E(S/A) or T(S/A)</b>	Listed as endangered or threatened because of similarity of appearance.
<b>(PS)</b>	Indicates "partial status" - status in only a portion of the species' range. Typically indicated in a "full" species record where an infraspecific taxon or population has U.S. ESA status, but the entire species does not.

## STATE STATUS (Georgia Department of Natural Resources, GA-DNR)

The following abbreviations are used to indicate the status of state-protected plants and animals or those proposed for state-protection in Georgia.

<b>E</b>	Listed as endangered. A species which is in danger of extinction throughout all or part of its range
<b>T</b>	Listed as threatened. A species which is likely to become an endangered species in the foreseeable future throughout all or parts of its range.
<b>R</b>	Listed as rare. A species which may not be endangered or threatened but which should be protected because of its scarcity.
<b>U</b>	Listed as unusual (and thus deserving of special consideration). Uncommon plants subject to commercial exploitation would have this status.

### NOTE:

This is a working list and is constantly revised. For the latest changes, acknowledgment of numerous sources, interpretation of data, or other information connected with this list, please contact:

Greg Krakow, Data Manager  
Georgia Department of Natural Resources  
Wildlife Resources Division  
Georgia Natural Heritage Program  
2117 U.S. Highway 278 S.E.  
Social Circle, Georgia 30025-4714  
Phone: 770-918-6411  
Fax: 706-557-3033  
E-mail: [greg\\_krakow@mail.dnr.state.ga.us](mailto:greg_krakow@mail.dnr.state.ga.us)


The proper citation for this list is:

Georgia Natural Heritage Program, (Edition starts from top right corner), (Title from top center), Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Social Circle.



**Special Concern Species Known from within a Half Mile Radius of the Proposed National Park Service Trails Construction Project at the Chattahoochee National Recreation Area in Cobb, DeKalb, Forsyth, Fulton, and Gwinnett Counties, Georgia**

Georgia Natural Heritage Program, 2117 US Hwy 278 SE, Social Circle, GA 30025, (770) 918-6411



According to our records, within one half mile of the project site (Forsyth County; Buford Dam Quadrangle), there are occurrences of the following:

*Aster georgianus* (Georgia Aster) 0.3 mi. NE of site

According to our records, within one half mile of the project site (Gwinnett County; Suwanee Quadrangle), there are occurrences of the following:

*Hydrastis canadensis* (Goldenseal) within the site

*Melanthium woodii* (Ozark Bunchflower) less than 0.1 mi. N of site

*Schisandra glabra* (Bay Starvine) within the site

*Waldsteinia lobata* (Piedmont Barren Strawberry) less than 0.1 mi. N of site

According to our records, within one half mile of the project site (Fulton County; Chamblee Quadrangle), there are occurrences of the following:

*Schisandra glabra* (Bay Starvine) 0.2 mi. N of site

*Schisandra glabra* (Bay Starvine) less than 0.1 mi. E of site

According to our records, within one half mile of the project site (Fulton County; Chamblee Quadrangle), there are occurrences of the following:

*Lampsilis subangulata* (Shinyrayed Pocketbook) within the site

*Quincuncina infucata* (Sculptured Pigtoe) within the site

According to our records, within one half mile of the project site (Fulton County; Sandy Springs Quadrangle), there are occurrences of the following:

*Schisandra glabra* (Bay Starvine) 0.1 mi. E of site

According to our records, within one half mile of the project site (Cobb County; Sandy Springs Quadrangle), there are occurrences of the following:

*Schisandra glabra* (Bay Starvine) 0.2 mi. E of site

Page Number 1 of 2

Report Generated 1 February 2001

**Special Concern Species Known from within a Half Mile Radius of the Proposed National Park Service Trails Construction Project at the Chattahoochee National Recreation Area in Cobb, DeKalb, Forsyth, Fulton, and Gwinnett Counties, Georgia**

Georgia Natural Heritage Program, 2117 US Hwy 278 SE, Social Circle, GA 30025, (770) 918-6411



According to our records, within one half mile of the project site (Forsyth County; Buford Dam Quadrangle), there are occurrences of the following:

*Aster georgianus* (Georgia Aster) 0.3 mi. NE of site

According to our records, within one half mile of the project site (Gwinnett County; Suwanee Quadrangle), there are occurrences of the following:

*Hydrastis canadensis* (Goldenseal) within the site

*Melanthium woodii* (Ozark Bunchflower) less than 0.1 mi. N of site

*Schisandra glabra* (Bay Starvine) within the site

*Waldsteinia lobata* (Piedmont Barren Strawberry) less than 0.1 mi. N of site

According to our records, within one half mile of the project site (Fulton County; Chamblee Quadrangle), there are occurrences of the following:

*Schisandra glabra* (Bay Starvine) 0.2 mi. N of site

*Schisandra glabra* (Bay Starvine) less than 0.1 mi. E of site

According to our records, within one half mile of the project site (Fulton County; Chamblee Quadrangle), there are occurrences of the following:

*Lampsilis subangulata* (Shinyrayed Pocketbook) within the site

*Quincuncina infucata* (Sculptured Pigtoe) within the site

According to our records, within one half mile of the project site (Fulton County; Sandy Springs Quadrangle), there are occurrences of the following:

*Schisandra glabra* (Bay Starvine) 0.1 mi. E of site

According to our records, within one half mile of the project site (Cobb County; Sandy Springs Quadrangle), there are occurrences of the following:

*Schisandra glabra* (Bay Starvine) 0.2 mi. E of site

**Special Concern Species Known from within a Half Mile Radius of the Proposed National Park Service Trails Construction Project at the Chattahoochee National Recreation Area in Cobb, DeKalb, Forsyth, Fulton, and Gwinnett Counties, Georgia**

Georgia Natural Heritage Program, 2117 US Hwy 278 SE, Social Circle, GA 30025, (770) 918-6411



According to our records, within one half mile of the project site (Fulton and Cobb counties; Sandy Springs Quadrangle), there are occurrences of the following:

*Elliptio fraterna* (Brother Spike) within the site (Cobb County)  
*Quincuncina infucata* (Sculptured Pigtoe), an imprecise location, within the site (Cobb County)  
*Schisandra glabra* (Bay Starvine) less than 0.1 mi. E of site (Fulton County)  
*Schisandra glabra* (Bay Starvine) within the site (Cobb County)

According to our records, within one half mile of the project site (Fulton and Cobb Counties; Northwest Atlanta Quadrangle), there are occurrences of the following:

*Fothergilla major* (Mountain Witch-alder) within the site (Fulton County)  
*Melanthium latifolium* (Broadleaf Bunchflower) approx. 0.5 mi. W of site (Cobb County)  
*Nestronia umbellula* (Indian Olive) approx. 0.5 mi. W of site (Cobb County)  
*Schisandra glabra* (Bay Starvine) 0.2 mi. E of site (Fulton County)

According to our records, within one half mile of the project site (Fulton County; Northwest Atlanta Quadrangle), there are occurrences of the following:

*Schisandra glabra* (Bay Starvine) within the site

Table 1. List of Georgia Heritage Program Plants and Animals Recorded Within The USGS Quad Sheets for the Chattahoochee River Area  
(Georgia Heritage Program Database, August 2000)

Quarter Quad Sheet record	Scientific Name	Common Name	Global Rank, State Rank, Federal Status, State Status <sup>1</sup>	Habitat
Buford Dam (NE)	Melanthium woodii	Ozark Bunchflower	G5 S2 — —	Mesic hardwood forests over basic soils
Buford Dam (SE)	Melanthium woodii	Ozark Bunchflower	G5 S2 — —	Mesic hardwood forests over basic soils
Buford Dam (SW)	Aster georgianus	Georgia Aster	G2G3 S2 — —	Upland oak-hickory-pine forests; especially with Echinaceae laevigata
Suwanee (NW)	Hydrastis canadensis	Goldenseal	G4 S2 — E	Rich woods in circumneutral soil
	Melanthium woodii	Ozark Bunchflower	G5 S2 — —	Mesic hardwood forests over basic soils
	Schisandra glabra	Bay Starvine	G3S2 — T	Stream terraces
	Waldsteinia lobata	Piedmont Barren Strawberry	G2? S2 — T	Stream terraces and adjacent gneiss outcrops
Humming (NE)	Amorpha schwerinii	Schwerin Indigo-bush	G3T2 S1 — —	Riverside terraces; borders of swampy floodplain woods, sometimes dominated by wiregrass and pine
	Platanthera integrilabia	Monkeyface Orchid	G2G3 S1S2 — T	Red maple-gum swamps; peaty seeps and streambanks with Parnassia asarifolia and Oxypolis rigidior asarifolia
Roswell (SE)	Schisandra glabra	Bay Starvine	G3 S2 — T	Stream terraces
	Waldsteinia lobata	Piedmont Barren Strawberry	G2? S2 — T	Stream terraces and adjacent gneiss outcrops
Roswell (SW)	Cyprinella callitaenia	Bluestripe Shiner	G2 S2 — T	Flowing areas in large creeks and medium-sized rivers over rocky substrates
	Lampsilis subangulata	Shiny-rayed Pocketbook	G2 S3 LE E	Sandy/rocky medium-sized rivers & creeks
	Notropis hypsilepis	Hightscale Shiner	G3 S2S3 — T	Flowing areas of small to large streams over sand or bedrock substrates
	Quincuncina infucata	Sculptured Pigtoe	G4 S3 — —	Main channels of rivers and large streams with moderate current in sand and limestone rock substrate
	Rhus michauxii	Dwarf Sumac	G2 S1 LE E	Open forests over ultramafic rock
Chamblee (NE)	Schisandra glabra	Bay Starvine	G3 S2 — T	Stream terraces
Chamblee (NW)	Quincuncina infucata	Sculptured Pigtoe	G4 S3 — —	Main channels of rivers and large streams with moderate current in sand and limestone rock

C:\windows\TEMP\ME2F51.DOC

Table 1. List of Georgia Heritage Program Plants and Animals Recorded Within The USGS Quad Sheets for the Chattahoochee River Area  
(Georgia Heritage Program Database, August 2000)

	Schisandra glabra	Bay Starvine		G3 S2 — T	Stream terraces
Chamblee (SE)	Schisandra glabra	Bay Starvine		G3 S2 — T	Stream terraces
Chamblee (SW)	Schisandra glabra	Bay Starvine		G3 S2 — T	Stream terraces
Northwest Atlanta (NE)	Aster georgianus	Georgia Aster		G2G3 S2 — —	Upland oak-hickory-pine forests; especially with Echinaceae laevigata
	Elliptio fraterna	Brother Spike		G1G2Q S1 — —	Sandy substrates of river channels with swift current
	Fothergilla major	Mountain Witch-alder		G3 S1 — —	Rocky (sandstone, granite) woods; bouldery stream margins
	Quincuncina infucata	Sculptured Pigtoe		G4 S3 — —	Main channels of rivers and large streams with moderate current in sand and limestone rock substrate
	Schisandra glabra	Bay Starvine		G3 S2 — T	Stream terraces
Northwest Atlanta (SW)	Aster georgianus	Georgia Aster		G2G3 S2 — —	Upland oak-hickory-pine forests; especially with Echinaceae laevigata
	Elliptio fraterna	Brother Spike		G3 S1 — —	Rocky (sandstone, granite) woods; bouldery stream margins
	Fothergilla major	Mountain Witch-alder		G5S2?	Mesic deciduous hardwood forests
	Melanthium latifolium	Broadleaf Bunchflower		G4 S2 — T	Mixed with dwarf shrubby heaths in oak-hickory-pine woods; often in transition areas between flatwoods and uplands
	Nestronia umbellula	Indian Olive		G4 S3 — —	Main channels of rivers and large streams with moderate current in sand and limestone rock substrate
	Quincuncina infucata	Sculptured Pigtoe		G3 S2 — T	Stream terraces
	Schisandra glabra	Bay Starvine		G2G3 S2 — —	Upland oak-hickory-pine forests; especially with Echinaceae laevigata
Northwest Atlanta (SE)	Aster georgianus	Georgia Aster		G3 S2 — T	Stream terraces
	Schisandra glabra	Bay Starvine		G2G3 S2 — —	Upland oak-hickory-pine forests; especially with Echinaceae laevigata
Northwest Atlanta (SW)	Aster georgianus	Georgia Aster		G3 S2 — T	Stream terraces
	Schisandra glabra	Bay Starvine		G4 S3 — —	Main channels of rivers and large streams with
Andy Springs	Quincuncina infucata	Sculptured Pigtoe			

C:\windows\TEMP\ME2F51.DOC



(NE)			Dwarf Sumac	G2 S1 LE E	moderate current in sand and limestone rock substrate Open forests over ultramafic rock
	Rhus michauxii		Bay Starvine	G3 S2 — T	Stream terraces
Sandy Springs (NW)	Schisandra glabra		Monkeyface Orchid	G2G3 S1S2 — T	Red maple-gum swamps; peaty seeps and streambanks with Parnassia asarifolia and Oxyopsis rigidior asarifolia
	Quincuncina infucata		Sculptured Pigtoe	G4 S3 — —	Main channels of rivers and large streams with moderate current in sand and limestone rock substrate
	Schisandra glabra		Bay Starvine	G3 S2 — T	Stream terraces
Sandy Springs (SE)	Elliptio fraterna		Brother Spike	G1G2Q S1 — —	Sandy substrates of river channels with swift current
	Fothergilla major		Mountain Witch-alder	G3 S1 — —	Rocky (sandstone, granite) woods; bouldery stream margins
	Quincuncina infucata		Sculptured Pigtoe	G4 S3 — —	Main channels of rivers and large streams with moderate current in sand and limestone rock substrate
	Schisandra glabra		Bay Starvine	G3 S2 — T	Stream terraces
Sandy Springs (SW)	Elliptio fraterna		Brother Spike	G1G2Q S1 — —	Sandy substrates of river channels with swift current
	Fothergilla major		Mountain Witch-alder	G3 S1 — —	Rocky (sandstone, granite) woods; bouldery stream margins
	Melanthium latifolium Nestronia umbellula		Broadleaf Bunchflower Indian Olive	G5S2? G4 S2 — T	Mesic deciduous hardwood forests Mixed with dwarf shrubby heaths in oak-hickory-pine woods; often in transition areas between flatwoods and uplands
	Quincuncina infucata		Sculptured Pigtoe	G4 S3 — —	Main channels of rivers and large streams with moderate current in sand and limestone rock substrate
	Schisandra glabra		Bay Starvine	G3 S2 — T	Stream terraces

Global Rank, State Rank, Federal Status, State Status, based on the following system from the Georgia Heritage Program:

(Edition date: 14 May 1999)

## EXPLANATION OF RARITY RANKS AND LEGAL STATUSES

C:\windows\TEMP\~ME2F51.DOC

Table 1. List of Georgia Heritage Program Plants and Animals Recorded Within The USGS Quad Sheets for the Chattahoochee River Area  
(Georgia Heritage Program Database, August 2000)

The "Global Rank" and "State Rank" columns indicate relative rarity of species at the rangewide or global level and the Georgia or state level, respectively. A simplified, standardized explanation of these ranks and of federal and state protection status follows.

**STATE PROTECTION STATUS (Georgia Natural Heritage Program, 2000):**

S1[G1] = Critically imperiled in state [globally] because of extreme rarity (5 or fewer occurrences).  
S2[G2] = Imperiled in state [globally] because of rarity (6 to 20 occurrences).  
S3[G3] = Rare or uncommon in state [rare and local throughout range or in a special habitat or narrowly endemic] (on the order of 21 to 100 occurrences).  
S4[G4] = Apparently secure in state [globally] (of no immediate conservation concern).  
S5[G5] = Demonstrably secure in state [globally].

SA = Accidental in state, including species (usually birds or butterflies) recorded once or twice or only at very great intervals.  
SR = Regularly occurring, usually migratory and typically non-breeding species.

SI[G1] = Reported from the state, but without persuasive documentation (no precise site records and no verification of taxonomy).  
SU[G1] = Possibly in part in state [range-wide] but status uncertain; need more information on threats.

SK[GK] = Apparently extirpated from state [extinct throughout range]. GXC is known only in cultivation/captivity.

SE = An exotic established in state; may be native elsewhere in North America; sometimes nativity is difficult to determine (SE7).

SH[G1] = Of historical occurrence in the state [throughout its range], perhaps not verified in the past 20 years, but suspected to be still extant (these organisms/communities need to be relocated).

[T] = Taxonomic subdivision (trinomial, either a subspecies or variety), used in a global rank, for example "Q2T12".

Q = Denotes a taxonomic question - either the taxon is not generally recognized as valid, or there is reasonable concern about its validity or identity globally or at the state level.

? = Denotes questionable rank; best guess given whenever possible.

**FEDERAL STATUS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, USFWS):**

LE = Listed endangered. The most critically threatened species. A species that may become extinct or disappear from a significant part of its range if not immediately protected.

LT = Listed threatened. The next most critical level of threatened species. A species that may become endangered if not protected.

PE or PT = Candidate species currently proposed for listing as endangered or threatened.

C = Candidate species presently under status review for federal listing for which adequate information exists on biological vulnerability and threats to list the taxa as endangered or threatened.

~N = Status varies for different populations or parts of range with at least one part not listed (e.g., a species with part of its range assigned by USFWS as threatened, would be recorded as "LT~N").

~LTLN.

**STATE AND FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS ON NATURAL RESOURCES, 2000/01:**

The following abbreviations are used to indicate the status of state-protected plants and animals or those proposed for state-protection in Georgia.

E = Listed as endangered.

T = Listed as threatened.

I = Listed as rare.

U = Listed as unusual (and thus deserving of special consideration), for example: plants subject to commercial exploitation.

\\windows\TEMP\M2F51.DOC



United States Department of the Interior

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

247 South Milledge Avenue  
Athens, Georgia 30605

West Georgia Sub Office  
P.O. Box 52560  
Ft. Benning, Georgia 31995-2560

Coastal Sub Office  
4270 Norwich Street  
Brunswick, Georgia 31520

February 20, 2001

Sean R. Wallace  
Parsons Engineering Science, Inc.  
5390 Triangle Parkway, Suite 100  
Norcross, Georgia 30092

RE: FWS Log No. NG-01-88-FORS

Dear Mr. Wallace:

As you requested, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) submits the following comments on potential threatened and endangered species in Cobb, DeKalb, Forsyth, Fulton, and Gwinnett Counties. This letter is in accordance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), regarding listed species that may occur within the delineated boundaries of the National Park Service recreation areas provided to the Service in a previous letter dated December 13, 2000.

The table provided appears to be a complete listing of threatened and endangered species that may potentially occur within the above counties. The Service recommends the monkey-face orchid (*Platanthera integrilabia*) be cross-listed with the white fringeless orchid (*Platanthera integrilabia*), a federal candidate species.

If you have questions or need additional information, please contact Kim Jefferson in the Athens office at (706) 613-9493 ext. 22.

Sincerely,

Sandra S. Tucker  
Field Supervisor



## LISTED SPECIES IN COBB COUNTY

### FEDERAL ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES<sup>1</sup>

#### Animals

Bald eagle (T,SE)	<u>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</u>	Inland waterways and estuarine areas in Georgia
Red-cockaded woodpecker (E,SE)	<u>Picoides borealis</u>	Nest in mature pine with low understory vegetation (<1.5m); forage in pine and pine hardwood stands ≥30 years of age, preferably ≥10" dbh
Cherokee darter (T,ST)	<u>Etheostoma scotti</u>	Shallow water (0.1-0.5 m) in small to medium warm water creeks (1-15 m wide) with predominantly rocky bottoms. Usually found in sections with reduced current, typically runs above and below riffles and at ecotones of riffles and backwaters.
Gulf moccasinshell mussel (E,SE)	<u>Medionidus penicillatus</u>	Medium streams to large rivers with slight to moderate current over sand and gravel substrates; may be associated with muddy sand substrates around tree roots

#### Plants

Michaux's sumac (E,SE)	<u>Rhus michauxii</u>	Sandy or rocky open woods, usually on ridges with a disturbance history (periodic fire, prior agricultural use, maintained right-of-ways); the known population of this species in Cobb County has been extirpated (last seen in county in 1900)
------------------------	-----------------------	--

SPECIES OF MANAGEMENT CONCERN<sup>1</sup>: The Fish and Wildlife Service is evaluating population trends and threats to the following Species of Management Concern. Please contact us at 247 S. Milledge Ave., Athens, GA, 706-613-9493, if you locate these species during site surveys or have other information on the species' distributions in Georgia.

#### Animals

Bachman's sparrow (SR)	<u>Aimophila aestivalis</u>	Abandoned fields with scattered shrubs, pines, or oaks
Appalachian Bewick's wren (SR)	<u>Thyromanes bewickii altus</u>	Dense undergrowth, overgrown fields, thickets, and brush in open or semi-open habitat; feed primarily on insects
Bluestripe shiner (ST)	<u>Cyprinella callitaenia</u>	Brownwater streams

#### Plants

Monkey-face (ST)	<u>Platanthera integrilabia</u>	Red maple-blackgum swamps; also on sandy damp stream margins; or on seepy, rocky, thinly vegetated slopes
------------------	---------------------------------	---

STATE OF GEORGIA ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES<sup>1</sup>: The following species, as well as the Species of Management Concern marked above (SE, ST, SR), are protected by the State. For information on State listed species, contact the GA Department of Natural Resources, GA Natural Heritage Program, 2117 US HWY 278 SE, Social Circle, GA 30279 (706-557-3032).

#### Plants

Granite whitlow-grass (SE)	<u>Draba aprica</u>	Shallow soils on granite outcrops, especially beneath eastern redcedar
Indian olive (ST)	<u>Nestronia umbellula</u>	Dry open upland forests of mixed hardwood and pine
Bay star-vine (ST)	<u>Schisandra glabra</u>	Twining on subcanopy and understory trees/shrubs in rich alluvial woods

<sup>1</sup> Key to notations: E = endangered, T = threatened, and R = rare. The SE, ST, and SR indicate species also listed by the State of Georgia as endangered, threatened, and rare, respectively.

Updated February 2000

## LISTED SPECIES IN DEKALB COUNTY

### FEDERAL ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES<sup>1</sup>

#### Animals

Gray bat (E,SE)	<u><i>Myotis grisescens</i></u>	Colonies restricted to caves or cave-like habitats; forage primarily over water along rivers or lake shores
Bald eagle (T,SE)	<u><i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i></u>	Inland waterways and estuarine areas in Georgia
Red-cockaded woodpecker (E,SE)	<u><i>Picoides borealis</i></u>	Nest in mature pine with low understory vegetation (<1.5m); forage in pine and pine hardwood stands ≥30 years of age, preferably ≥10" dbh

#### Plants

Little amphianthus (T,ST)	<u><i>Amphianthus pusillus</i></u>	Shallow pools on granite outcrops, where water collects after a rain. Pools are less than 1 foot deep and rock rimmed.
Black-spored quillwort (E,SE)	<u><i>Isoetes melanospora</i></u>	Shallow pools on granite outcrops, where water collects after a rain. Pools are less than 1 foot deep and rock rimmed.

**SPECIES OF MANAGEMENT CONCERN<sup>1</sup>:** The Fish and Wildlife Service is evaluating population trends and threats to the following Species of Management Concern. Please contact us at 247 S. Milledge Ave., Athens, GA, 706-613-9493, if you locate these species during site surveys or have other information on the species' distributions in Georgia.

#### Animals

Bachman's sparrow (SR)	<u><i>Aimophila aestivalis</i></u>	Abandoned fields with scattered shrubs, pines, or oaks
Appalachian Bewick's wren (SR)	<u><i>Thyromanes bewickii altus</i></u>	Dense undergrowth, overgrown fields, thickets, and brush in open or semi-open habitat; feed primarily on insects
Bluestripe shiner (ST)	<u><i>Cyprinella callitaenia</i></u>	Brownwater streams

#### Plants

Flatrock onion (ST)	<u><i>Allium speculae</i></u>	Seepy edges of vegetation mats on outcrops of granitic rock
Alexander rock aster	<u><i>Aster avitus</i></u>	
Small-headed pipewort	<u><i>Eriocaulon komickianum</i></u>	Granite outcrops and upland-sandhill-acid seeps

**STATE OF GEORGIA ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES<sup>1</sup>:** The following species, as well as the Species of Management Concern marked above (SE, ST, SR), are protected by the State. For information on State listed species, contact the GA Department of Natural Resources, GA Natural Heritage Program, 2117 US HWY 278 SE, Social Circle, GA 30279 (706-557-3032).

#### Plants

Indian olive (ST)	<u><i>Negronia umbellula</i></u>	Dry open upland forests of mixed hardwood and pine
Bay star-vine (ST)	<u><i>Schisandra glabra</i></u>	Twining on subcanopy and understory trees/shrubs in rich alluvial woods
Granite rock stonecrop (ST)	<u><i>Sedum pusillum</i></u>	Granite outcrops among mosses in partial shade under red cedar trees
Piedmont barren strawberry (ST)	<u><i>Waldsteinia lobata</i></u>	Rocky acidic woods along streams with mountain laurel; rarely in drier upland oak-hickory-pine woods

<sup>1</sup> Key to notations: E = endangered, T = threatened, and R = rare. The SE, ST, and SR indicate species also listed by the State of Georgia as endangered, threatened, and rare, respectively.

Updated February 2000

## LISTED SPECIES IN FORSYTH COUNTY

### FEDERAL ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES<sup>1</sup>

#### Animals

Bald eagle (T,SE)	<u>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</u>	Inland waterways and estuarine areas in Georgia
Red-cockaded woodpecker (E,SE)	<u>Picoides borealis</u>	Nest in mature pine with low understory vegetation (<1.5m); forage in pine and pine hardwood stands ≥30 years of age, preferably ≥10" dbh

**SPECIES OF MANAGEMENT CONCERN<sup>1</sup>:** The Fish and Wildlife Service is evaluating population trends and threats to the following Species of Management Concern. Please contact us at 247 S. Milledge Ave., Athens, GA, 706-613-9493, if you locate these species during site surveys or have other information on the species' distributions in Georgia.

#### Animals

Bachman's sparrow (SR)	<u>Aimophila aestivalis</u>	Abandoned fields with scattered shrubs, pines, or oaks
Bluestripe shiner (ST)	<u>Cyprinella callitaenia</u>	Brownwater streams

#### Plants

Monkey-face (ST)	<u>Platanthera integrilabia</u>	Red maple-blackgum swamps; also on sandy damp stream margins; or on seepy, rocky, thinly vegetated slopes
------------------	---------------------------------	---

**STATE OF GEORGIA ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES<sup>1</sup>:** The following species, as well as the Species of Management Concern marked above (SE, ST, SR), are protected by the State. For information on State listed species, contact the GA Department of Natural Resources, GA Natural Heritage Program, 2117 US HWY 278 SE, Social Circle, GA 30279 (706-557-3032).

#### Animals

Frecklebelly madtom (SE)	<u>Noturus munitus</u>	Rivers with moderate to swift current over substrates ranging from coarse gravel to boulders, submerged trees, and brush.
--------------------------	------------------------	---

#### Plants

Piedmont barren strawberry (ST)	<u>Waldsteinia lobata</u>	Rocky acidic woods along streams with mountain laurel; rarely in drier upland oak-hickory-pine woods
---------------------------------	---------------------------	--

<sup>1</sup> Key to notations: E = endangered, T = threatened, and R = rare. The SE, ST, and SR indicate species also listed by the State of Georgia as endangered, threatened, and rare, respectively.

Updated February 2000

## FULTON COUNTY

### FEDERAL ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES<sup>1</sup>

#### Animals

Bald eagle (T,SE)	<u>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</u>	Inland waterways and estuarine areas in Georgia
Red-cockaded woodpecker (E,SE)	<u>Picoides borealis</u>	Nest in mature pine with low understory vegetation (<1.5m); forage in pine and pine hardwood stands ≥30 years of age, preferably ≥10" dbh
Gulf moccasinshell mussel (E,SE)	<u>Medionidus penicillatus</u>	Medium streams to large rivers with slight to moderate current over sand and gravel substrates; may be associated with muddy sand substrates around tree roots

SPECIES OF MANAGEMENT CONCERN<sup>1</sup>: The Fish and Wildlife Service is evaluating population trends and threats to the following Species of Management Concern. Please contact us at 247 S. Milledge Ave., Athens, GA, 706-613-9493, if you locate these species during site surveys or have other information on the species' distributions in Georgia.

#### Animals

Bachman's sparrow (SR)	<u>Aimophila aestivalis</u>	Abandoned fields with scattered shrubs, pines, or oaks
Appalachian Bewick's wren (SR)	<u>Thyromanes bewickii altus</u>	Dense undergrowth, overgrown fields, thickets, and brush in open or semi-open habitat; feed primarily on insects
Bluestripe shiner (ST)	<u>Cyprinella callitaenia</u>	Brownwater streams

STATE OF GEORGIA ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES<sup>1</sup>: The following species, as well as the Species of Management Concern marked above (SE, ST, SR), are protected by the State. For information on State listed species, contact the GA Department of Natural Resources, GA Natural Heritage Program, 2117 US HWY 278 SE, Social Circle, GA 30279 (706-557-3032).

#### Animals

Peregrine falcon (SE)	<u>Falco peregrinus</u>	<u>F. p. anatum</u> nests on cliffs, high hills, or tall buildings; <u>F. p. tundrius</u> primarily seen in Georgia migrating along the coast
-----------------------	-------------------------	---

#### Plants

Bay star-vine (ST)	<u>Schisandra glabra</u>	Twining on subcanopy and understory trees/shrubs in rich alluvial woods
Piedmont barren strawberry (ST)	<u>Waldsteinia lobata</u>	Rocky acidic woods along streams with mountain laurel; rarely in drier upland oak-hickory-pine woods

<sup>1</sup> Key to notations: E = endangered, T = threatened, and R = rare. The SE, ST, and SR indicate species also listed by the State of Georgia as endangered, threatened, and rare, respectively.

Updated February 2000

## LISTED SPECIES IN GWINNETT COUNTY

### FEDERAL ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES<sup>1</sup>

#### Animals

Bald eagle (T,SE) Haliaeetus leucocephalus Inland waterways and estuarine areas in Georgia  
Red-cockaded woodpecker (E,SE) Picoides borealis Nest in mature pine with low understory vegetation (<1.5m); forage in pine and pine hardwood stands ≥30 years of age, preferably ≥10" dbh

#### Plants

Little amphianthus (T,ST) Amphianthus pusillus Shallow pools on granite outcrops, where water collects after a rain. Pools are less than 1 foot deep and rock rimmed.  
Black-spored quillwort (E,SE) Isoetes melanospora Shallow pools on granite outcrops, where water collects after a rain. Pools are less than 1 foot deep and rock rimmed.  
Michaux's sumac (E,SE) Rhus michauxii Sandy or rocky open woods, usually on ridges with a disturbance history (periodic fire, prior agricultural use, maintained right-of-ways); the known population of this species in Gwinnett County has been extirpated

**SPECIES OF MANAGEMENT CONCERN<sup>1</sup>:** The Fish and Wildlife Service is evaluating population trends and threats to the following Species of Management Concern. Please contact us at 247 S. Milledge Ave., Athens, GA, 706-613-9493, if you locate these species during site surveys or have other information on the species' distributions in Georgia.

#### Animals

Bluestripe shiner (ST) Cyprinella callitaenia Brownwater streams  
Northern pine snake Pituophis m. melanoleucus

#### Plants

Alexander rock aster Aster avitus  
Small-headed pipewort Eriocaulon kornickianum Granite outcrops and upland-sandhill-acid seeps

**STATE OF GEORGIA ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES<sup>1</sup>:** The following species, as well as the Species of Management Concern marked above (SE, ST, SR), are protected by the State. For information on State listed species, contact the GA Department of Natural Resources, GA Natural Heritage Program, 2117 US HWY 278 SE, Social Circle, GA 30279 (706-557-3032).

#### Plants

Golden seal (SE) Hydrastis canadensis Rich woods and cove forests in the mountains  
Bay star-vine (ST) Schisandra glabra Twining on subcanopy and understory trees/shrubs in rich alluvial woods  
Granite rock stonecrop (ST) Sedum pusillum Granite outcrops among mosses in partial shade under red cedar trees  
Piedmont barren strawberry (ST) Waldsteinia lobata Rocky acidic woods along streams with mountain laurel; rarely in drier upland oak-hickory-pine woods

<sup>1</sup> Key to notations: E = endangered, T = threatened, and R = rare. The SE, ST, and SR indicate species also listed by the State of Georgia as endangered, threatened, and rare, respectively.

Updated February 2000

**COORDINATION WITH FEDERALLY- RECOGNIZED AMERICAN INDIAN TRIBES  
WITH ANCESTRAL LANDS IN GEORGIA AND THE state historic preservation officer**

Consultation letters were sent in January 2001 to Federally- recognized American Indian Tribes with ancestral lands in Georgia requesting feedback concerning this GMP/EIS. These letters were followed up with individual phone calls. Additional letters were sent in March 2002 identifying the purpose and need of the project and requesting input. A copy of this letter request and the list of American Indian Tribes contacted follows. In addition, this letter request was also sent to the State Historic Preservation Officer.

**Federally Recognized American Indian Tribes with Ancestral Lands in Georgia**

Name	Contact Name and Title	Contact Address
Alabama- Coushatta Tribe of Texas	Mr. Kevin P. Battise, Chairman Ph: (409) 563- 4391 Fax: (409) 563- 4397	Route 3, P.O. Box 640, Livingston, TX 77351
Alabama- Quassarte Tribal Town (Creek)	Tarpie Yargee, Chief Ph: (405) 452- 3968 Fax: (405) 452- 3968	P.O. Box 187, Wetumka, OK 74883
Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma	Mr. Chad Smith, Principal Chief Ph: (918) 456- 0671 Fax: (918) 458- 5580	P.O. Box 948, Tahlequah, OK 74465
Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana (Creek)	Mr. Lovelin Poncho, Chairman Ph: (337) 584- 2261 Fax: (337) 584- 2998	P.O. Box 818, Elton, LA 70532
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians	Mr. Leon Jones, Principal Chief Ph: (828) 497- 2771 Fax: (828) 497- 7007	Qualla Boundary, P.O. Box 455 Cherokee, NC 28719
Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma	Charles D. Enyart, Chief Ph: (918) 666- 2435 Fax: (918) 666- 3325	P.O. Box 350 Seneca, MO 64865
Kialegee Tribal Town (Creek)	Lowell Wesley, Town King Ph: (405) 452- 3262 Fax: (405) 452- 3413	P.O. Box 332 Wetumka, OK 74883
Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida	Mr. Billy Cypress, Chairman Ph: (305) 223- 8380 Fax: (305) 223- 1011	Tamiami Station P.O. Box 440021 Miami, FL 33144
Muscogee Nation of Oklahoma (Creek)	Mr. Perry Beaver, Principal Chief PH: (918) 756- 8700 Fax: (918) 756- 2911	P.O. Box 580 Okmulgee, OK 74447
Poarch Band of Creek Indians of Alabama	Mr. Eddie Tullis, Chief Ph: (251) 368- 9136 Fax: (251- 368- 1026	5811 Jack Springs Rd., Atmore, AL 36502
Seminole Nation of Oklahoma	Mr. Jerry Haney, Principal Chief Ph: (405) 257- 6287 Fax: (405) 257- 6205	P.O. Box 1498 Wewoka, OK 74884
Seminole Tribe of Florida	Mr. James Billie, Chairman Ph: (954) 966- 6500 Fax: (954) 967- 3486	6300 Stirling Road, Room 421, Hollywood, FL 33024
Thlopthlocco Tribal Town (Creek)	Ms. Grace Bunner, Town King Ph: (918) 623- 2620 Fax: (918) 623- 0419	P.O. Box 188 Okemah, OK 74859
United Keetoowah Band (Cherokee)	Dallas Proctor, Chief Ph: (918) 431- 1818 Fax: (918) 431- 1873	P.O. Box 189 Parkhill, OK 74451

Source: BIA (2002) = Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. *Tribal Leaders Directory*. January 2002



United States Department of Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER NATIONAL RECREATION AREA  
1978 Island Ford Parkway  
Atlanta, Georgia 30350-3400

D18 (CHAT)

March 27, 2002

Mr. Kevin P Battise, Chairman  
Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas  
PO Box 640  
Livingston, TX 77351

Dear Mr. Battise:

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190, as amended) (NEPA), the National Park Service (NPS) is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the General Management Plan (GMP) for Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area, Georgia (CRNRA). A regional map of the park is available on the Internet at [www.npsplanning.org](http://www.npsplanning.org). Two additional maps are attached to assist you in locating the park in relation to the southeastern states and within metro Atlanta. The purpose of this letter is to request your comments on issues of concern that you might have regarding the updating of the GMP and input on the future management approaches for the park. We originally wrote to you in January 2001 and hope that this letter serves as a reminder that we welcome your input.

**The Purpose and Need:** The purpose of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area is to lead the preservation and protection of the 48 mile Chattahoochee River corridor from Buford Dam to Peachtree Creek, and its associated natural and cultural resources, for the benefit and enjoyment of the people. The general management planning process provides a comprehensive approach to establish the basic management philosophy for the park and provide strategies for addressing issues and achieving identified management objectives. The GMP/EIS will evaluate the environmental impacts of a range of alternatives to address distinct management approaches to preserving significant natural and cultural resources for public enjoyment, competing demands for limited resources, priorities for using available funds and



staff, and differing local and nationwide interests and views of what is most important.


**The Process and Importance of Public Input:** The intent of the NEPA scoping process is to provide for early identification of concerns, issues, expectations, and values of existing and potential visitors, neighbors, people with traditional cultural ties to lands within the park, cooperating associations, other partners, scientists, scholars, and other government agencies. Public input gathered during this scoping process will be used in the EIS to assess and compare the effects of each available management alternative on the natural and man-made environment. The EIS will also recommend selection of a "preferred" management alternative. The National Park Service is requesting your input in these early stages of this project.

**Who to Contact:** If you are interested in providing input on the updated GMP/EIS, you are invited to respond in writing to:

Mr. Kevin Cheri, Superintendent  
Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area  
1978 Island Ford Parkway  
Atlanta, GA 30350-3400  
Phone (770)-399-8074 extension 221

Full public participation by federal, state, and local agencies, as well as other concerned organizations and private citizens, is invited throughout the preparation process of the updated GMP/EIS. The National Park Service would like to thank you for reviewing this scoping letter, and for preparing and submitting written comments.

Sincerely,




Kevin G. Cheri  
Superintendent





## Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area



*Park Boundary*

**APPENDIX G**

**SUMMARY OF TRANSPORTATION AND  
OTHER MAJOR IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS**

## **APPENDIX G: SUMMARY OF TRANSPORTATION AND OTHER MAJOR IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS**

### **TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS**

The Transportation Improvement Program, FY 2002- 2004, prepared by the Atlanta Regional Commission for the Atlanta Region, identifies transportation capacity improvements that are scheduled for construction in the area during the next three years. Projects that are scheduled for construction in the study area include the following:

#### **New Construction Projects**

The Northern ARC from GA 400 to the Chattahoochee River was proposed in 2002 but is no longer under consideration.

#### **Roadway Widening Projects**

- Cobb Parkway/US 41- GA 3 from Paces Mill Road to Akers Mill Road
- Old Alabama Road from Jones Bridge Road to GA 141/Medlock Bridge Road
- US 41/GA 3 –Northside Parkway at Chattahoochee River and approaches
- GA 20 from GA 400 to Sample Road
- Buford Dam Road from GA 9 to Sanders Road
- McGinnis Ferry Road from the Chattahoochee River to Sargent Road

There are also a number of bicycle and pedestrian facility projects in the study area that are scheduled for construction in the next three years. The TIP contains 240 bicycle and pedestrian projects scheduled for construction in the Atlanta Region during this period. Over 130 of these projects are in Cobb, DeKalb, Fulton, and Gwinnett Counties. Some of the projects that are located in the proximity of the park include:

#### **Bicycle Facilities**

- Medlock Bridge Road from Parsons Road to the Chattahoochee River
- Old Alabama Road from Riverside Drive to Market Boulevard
- Riverside Drive from Johnson Ferry to I- 285

GA 141/Peachtree Parkway from Spalding Drive to the Chattahoochee River

- Willeo/Azalea/Riverside from Cobb County line to GA 400.
- Vickery Creek from Riverwalk to Alpharetta border
- McGinnis Ferry Road from the Chattahoochee River to Sargent Road

#### **Pedestrian Facilities**

- Dunwoody Place from Roswell Road to Northridge Road
- Holcomb Bridge Road from Scott Road to Barnwell Road

Johns Creek Greenway from McGinnis Ferry Road at the Forsyth County Line to State Bridge Road at Aubrey Mill Reserve

Mt. Vernon Highway from Powers Ferry Road to Roswell Road

Northridge Road from Roswell Road to GA 400

Old Alabama Road from Riverside Drive to Market Boulevard

Peachtree Industrial Boulevard – Western Gwinnett County

Roswell Road from Cobb Parkway to Robinson Road

Johnson Ferry and Roswell Roads from Hildebrand to Johnson Ferry / Roswell to Abernathy Road

Paces Ferry Road from Peachtree Toad to the Chattahoochee River

The Atlanta Regional Commission has prepared an Atlanta Region 2025 Regional Transportation Plan to identify future needed transportation improvements in the Atlanta area. Forsyth County has also identified long range transportation projects that will be needed in the future. Numerous highway and transit projects are proposed that will improve access to the park. These projects include:

### **Highway Projects**

I- 285 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes (0 to 2 lanes)

I- 75 HOV lanes (0 to 2 lanes)

GA 400 from I- 285 to North Springs MARTA station (collector- distributor system)

GA 400 from I- 285 to McFarland Road HOV lanes (0 to 2 lanes)

GA 400 Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) monitoring

GA 400 from GA 120 to GA 20 widening (4 to 6 lanes)

GA 120/Abbotts Bridge Road from State Bridge Road to Peachtree Industrial Boulevard widening (2 to 4 lanes)

McGinnis Ferry Road from Gwinnett County Line to McFarland Road widening (2 to 4 lanes)

Morgan Falls Bridge Crossing from GA 400 to Lower Roswell Road

GA 20 from Samples Road to Peachtree Industrial Parkway widening (2 to 4 lanes)

James Burgess Road from GA 20 to Old Atlanta Road widening (2 to 3 lanes)

Cummings Highway to the east of Bowmans Island widening

Dunwoody Place near Vickery Creek and Island Ford widening

Roberts Drive near Island Ford widening

### **Transit Projects**

MARTA rail extension from North Springs station to Holcomb Bridge Road (new construction)

MARTA rail extension from Holcomb Bridge Road to Haynes Bridge Road (new construction)

MARTA rail extension from Haynes Bridge Road to Windward Parkway (new construction)

People mover near the Cumberland Mall/Cobb Galleria area

Express bus service to selected new rail stations

Expansion of local bus service in the study area, particularly in Gwinnett County

Park and Ride facility at GA 120/State Bridge Road

Park and Ride facility at GA 400/Windward Parkway

### **Bicycle /Pedestrian Projects**

Bicycle/pedestrian trail in Windemere development (Forsyth County)

GA 400 from Alpharetta City Limit to the Chattahoochee River

Riverside Road from GA 400 to Eves Road

Chattahoochee River from Riverside Road to Gwinnett County Line

### **NATIONAL PARK SERVICE PROJECTS**

The National Park Service has programmed for funding a number of projects. The majority of these projects include facility maintenance and improvements, boat ramp improvements, rest rooms, additional parking spaces, non-impervious trail improvements, species surveying, exotic species control efforts, and other similar types of projects. These projects are programmed for different locations throughout the park corridor and are not concentrated in any one area. Compliance activities with regard to these activities and other planning efforts would also be conducted.

### **OTHER MAJOR DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS IN THE METROPOLITAN REGION**

Located outside the park are geographic areas of rapidly growing Forsyth, Gwinnett, North Fulton and Cobb Counties, Georgia. Of regional consequence are regional private economic and public infrastructure development trends in the Georgia 400 Sub Area whose epicenter is the Chattahoochee River drainage basin as it winds through metropolitan Atlanta. A review of studies related to regional trends for residential, commercial – office and industrial construction in this described sub area, including Developments of Regional Impact (DRI), administered by the Atlanta Regional Commission and the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority, is provided in the paragraphs that follow. With 90 DRI projects listed, the text provides a summary of the trends used as the basis for the cumulative impacts scenarios described in this GMP. An overview of the growth trends and sample projects is described below based upon The Economic Base Report of the Northern Sub Area Georgia 400 Study.

**Residential** - “The number of housing units in the Northern Sub Area is projected at 493,836 in 2001 and 608,749 in 2006 (Source: ESRI Business Information Services). This represents a growth of 31.6% between 2000 and 2006. In the GA 400 Corridor, the number of housing units is expected to increase from 128,136 to 168,242 over the same period, representing a growth of 31.3%....Since 1995, metropolitan Atlanta has led the nation in the number of housing units authorized by building permits.....Gwinnett, Fulton and Cobb have the largest share of building permits since 1995.”

**Office** – “The northern office markets have added more square feet of space than any other market (in metro Atlanta) between the first quarter of 1999 and the 1st quarter of 2002. The growth rates experienced in these other markets have also been very high.”

The cumulative impact on the park regarding other actions by private development is 40,000 new housing units constructed in the North Sub Area Ga 400 Study Area and is further impacted as the leading area for construction of office and retail space since 1995.

## **Developments of Regional Impact**

Under the Georgia Planning Act, development projects that are likely to have an impact beyond the host local government jurisdiction are subject to review as Developments of Regional Impact (DRI). These specific large scale development projects were reviewed as they potentially impact the park. Since July 1, 2002, over 200 DRI have been reviewed statewide. Ninety projects were specific to the counties surrounding the park as well as nearby DeKalb County.

These types of developments are delineated into types of development, regions and square footage. The office space developments are all greater than 400,000 gross square feet. The commercial developments are greater than 300,000 gross square feet. Wholesale and distribution developments are greater than 500,000 gross square feet. Hospitals have more than 300 new beds. Housing has greater than 400 new lots or units.

Industrial has more than 500,000 gross square feet and employ more than 1600 workers covering more than 400 acres. There are 18 categories of DRIs and include mixed use developments (400,000 square feet and 120- acres), hotels (400 rooms plus) and wastewater facilities (expansion by at least 50% from existing structures). In the 90 approved DRI projects, all of these DRI categories described above have been constructed in the counties surrounding the park. Thirteen DRI projects in the counties surrounding the park were complete or pending in 2002 (Source: ARC 2002 Developments of Regional Impact Status) including: Worldspan at Cobb Galleria, MBNA America Operations Center in Cobb County, Logust Grove Station and Indian Creek in Gwinnett County, and the Cauley Creek Water Reclamation Facility in Fulton County. In addition, DeKalb County is redesigning the raw water pump station located on the Chattahoochee River.



## **APPENDIX H**

### **LIST OF RECIPIENTS**

## **LIST OF RECIPIENTS**

The Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement was distributed to the following delegates, agencies and organizations:

### **Georgia Congressional Delegation**

- Hon. David Scott
- Hon. Denise Majette
- Hon. Johnny Isakson
- Hon. Nathan Deal
- Hon. John Lewis
- Hon. John Linder
- Hon. Phil Gingrey
- Hon. Saxbly Chambliss
- Hon. Zell Miller

### **Federal Departments, Agencies, and Offices**

- Federal Emergency Management Association
- Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- U.S. Department of Agriculture
  - National Resources Conservation Service
- U.S. Department of Transportation
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
  - Criminal Investigation Division
  - Environmental Accountability Division
  - Watershed and Non- point Source Group
  - Water- Wetlands, Coastal and Water Quality Branch
- U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
- U.S. Forest Service
  - Chattahoochee- Oconee National Forest
- U.S. Geological Survey

### **State of Georgia**

- Georgia Department of Agriculture
- Georgia Department of Community Affairs
- Georgia Department of Industry
- Georgia Department of Natural Resources
  - Environmental Protection Division, Water Protection Branch
  - Georgia State Parks and Historical Sites
  - Historic Preservation Division
  - Pollution Prevention Assistance Division
  - Wildlife Resources Division, Fisheries Section (Buford Trout Hatchery)

- Georgia Department of Revenue
- Georgia Department of Transportation
- Georgia Environmental Facilities Authority
- Georgia Forestry Commission
- Georgia Greenspace Program
- Georgia Regional Transportation Authority
- Georgia Scenic Byways Program
- Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation
- Panola Mountain State Conservation Park
- Sweetwater Creek State Conservation Park

#### **County Agencies**

- Cherokee County
- Cobb County
  - Cobb Commission
  - Cobb County Department of Transportation
  - Cobb County Parks, Recreation and Cultural Affairs
  - Cobb County School District
  - Cobb Marietta Water Authority
- Dekalb County
  - Public Works, Water and Sewer Division
- Douglas County
- Forsyth County
  - Forsyth County Board of Commissioners
  - Forsyth County Parks and Recreation
  - Forsyth County Planning and Development
- Fulton County
  - Fulton County Board of Commissioners
  - Fulton County Department of Environmental and Community Development
  - Fulton County Department of Parks and Recreation
- Gwinnett County
  - Gwinnett County Board of Commissioners
  - Gwinnett County Department of Community Services
- Paulding County

#### **Local Agencies**

- City of Atlanta
  - Atlanta Urban Design Commission
  - Mayor of Atlanta
  - Mayor's Office of Community Affairs
  - Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority
- City of Austell
- City of Berkley Lake
- City of Buford

- City of Duluth
- City of Kennesaw
- City of Marietta
  - Marietta City Schools
- City of Powder Springs
- City of Roswell
  - Roswell Recreation and Parks Department
  - Roswell Visitors Center
- City of Sugarhill
- City of Suwanee

### **Organizations**

- Alliances for Better Education, Inc.
- American Water Resources Association
- Association of County Commissioners of GA
- Atlanta Audubon Society
- Atlanta Bicycle Campaign
- Atlanta Botanical Garden
- Atlanta Center for Excellence
- Atlanta Chamber of Commerce
- Atlanta Convention and Visitor Bureau
- Atlanta Fly Fishing Club
- Atlanta History Center
- Atlanta Journal Constitution
- Atlanta Junior Rowing Club
- Atlanta Outward Bound Center
- Atlanta Regional Commission
- Atlanta Sport & Social
- Atlanta Track Club
- Atlanta Whitewater Club
- Bells Ferry Civic Association
- Bicycle Federation of America
- Center for Neighborhood Technology
- Central Atlanta Progress
- Chattahoochee Hill Country Alliance
- Chattahoochee Nature Center
- Chattahoochee River Friends
- Chattahoochee Road Runners
- Chattahoochee Trail Horse Association
- Chattowah Open Land Trust
- Cobb Community Foundation
- Cobb County 4- H Club
- Cobb County Chamber of Commerce
- Cobb Landmarks & Historical Society

- Cobb Photographic Society
- Cochran Mill Nature Center & Arboretum, Inc.
- Cumberland CID
- Davidson- Arabia Mountain Nature Preserve
- DeKalb County Chamber of Commerce
- Dunwoody Nature Center, Inc.
- Earth Share of Georgia
- East Cobb Civic Association
- East Cobber
- Eco Action
- Environmental Defense Fund
- Environmental Education Alliance, Inc.
- Environmental Fund for GA
- Georgia Appalachian Trail Club
- Georgia Native Plant Society
- Garden Club of Georgia, Inc.
- Georgia Bicycle Federation
- Georgia Canoeing Association
- Georgia Chamber of Commerce
- Georgia Clean and Beautiful
- Georgia Endurance Riders Association
- Georgia Environmental Council, Inc.
- Georgia Environmental Organization, Inc.
- Georgia Environmental Policy Institute
- Georgia Forestry Association, Inc.
- Georgia Horse Council
- Georgia Lake Management Society
- Georgia Municipal Association
- Georgia Orienteering Club
- Georgia Ornithological Society
- Georgia Recycling Coalition
- Georgia Tech Crew
- Georgia Trend
- Georgia Trust/Historic Preservation
- Georgia Water & Pollution Control Association, Inc.
- Georgia Water Wise Council
- Georgia Wildlife Federation
- Georgians for Better Transportation
- Georgians for Transportation Alternatives
- Georgia Municipal Association
- Gwinnett Chamber of Commerce
- Gwinnett Open Land Trust
- Hands on Atlanta
- IMBA

- Izaak Walton League of America
- Keep Georgia Beautiful
- Kennesaw Archery Club
- Kennesaw State University
- Lake Allatoona Preservation Authority
- Latin American Association
- Life University
- Mable House
- Metro Chamber of Commerce
- Metro North Youth Soccer Association
- Metropolitan Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts
- Midtown Garden Club
- Mt. View Arts Alliance
- Mt. View Community Club
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
- National Parks Conservation Association
- Natural Science for Youth Foundation
- The Natural Step
- Nickajack Creek Watershed Alliance
- North Metro Tech
- Northridge Community Association
- Outdoor Activity Center
- Park Pride
- PATH Foundation
- Piedmont Park Conservancy
- PLAN, Inc.
- Powder Springs Civic Assoc.
- Regional Business Coalition
- River Through Atlanta
- Rockdale County Trail Riders
- Roswell Alpharetta Mountain Biking Association (RAMBO)
- Roswell Convention & Visitor Bureau
- Roswell Historical Society
- Saddle Up Cobb
- SCAT
- Sierra Club
- Sierra Club - Georgia Chapter
- Sierra Club, Centennial Group
- SORBA
- SORBA- Woodstock, GA Chapter
- South Cobb Community Center
- South Peachtree Creek Nature Preserve
- Southeast Land Preservation Trust
- Southeast Region Eastern National

- Southern Bicycle League
- Southern Conservation Trust
- Southern Off Road Bicycle Association
- St. Andrew Rowing Club
- The Conservation Fund
- The Georgia Conservancy
- The Georgia Wildlife Federation
- The National Trust
- The Nature Conservancy of Georgia
- The Star & Beacon
- The Trust for Public Land
- The Turner Foundation
- The University of Georgia
- The Wilderness Society
- Town Center Area CID
- Trees Atlanta
- Trout Unlimited
- Trout Unlimited Georgia Chapter
- Trout Unlimited Cohutta Chapter
- Upper Chattahoochee Riverkeeper
- Whitefield Academy
- Zoo Atlanta

### **Individuals and Others**

The Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement was also distributed to individuals, private companies, commercial institutions and numerous homeowners' associations on a mailing list maintained by the park.